



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ON LIBRARIES



029884 3



*James Lenox.*

ZFK





*James Lenox.*









VINDICIÆ  
ECCLESIAE ANGLICANÆ:

IN WHICH SOME OF THE  
FALSE REASONINGS, INCORRECT STATEMENTS,  
and PALPABLE MISREPRESENTATIONS,

*In a Publication entitled, "The True Churchmen  
ascertained," by JOHN OVERTON, A.B.*

ARE POINTED OUT.

BY THE  
REV. CHARLES DAUBENY,

Fellow of Winchester-College, Minister of Christ's-Church, Bath, and  
Author of "a Guide to the Church."

“ Τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθεῖ πάντα συνάδει τὰ ὑπάρχοντα,  
“ Τῷ δὲ ψευδεῖ ταχὺ διαφωνεῖ τ' ἀληθές.”

Aristot. Ethic. lib. i. cap. 8.

PRINTED FOR

F. AND C. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, LONDON;

BY R. CRUTTWELL, ST. JAMES'S-STREET, BATH.

1803.

NOV 1961  
CLUB  
YOUNG

TO THE REVEREND  
THE  
VICE-CHANCELLOR,  
AND THE  
HEADS OF HOUSES,  
IN THE  
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,  
THE  
*FOLLOWING SHEETS,*

FOR THE USE OF THE  
YOUNGER STUDENTS IN DIVINITY,  
SHOULD THEY BE DEEMED WORTHY THEIR ATTENTION,

ARE MOST RESPECTFULLY ADDRESSED,

BY THEIR MOST OBEYIENT SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

BATH, MAY 28, 1803.



1971-1972

1973-1974

1975-1976

1977-1978

1979-1980

1981-1982

1983-1984

1985-1986

1987-1988

1989-1990

1991-1992

1993-1994

1995-1996

1997-1998

1999-2000

2001-2002

2003-2004



## CHAPTER V.

<i>The Investigation continued, with respect to the Doctrine of Repentance.</i>	233
---	-----

## CHAPTER VI.

<i>The Question prosecuted with regard to the Doctrine of Justification.</i>	233
--	-----

## CHAPTER VII.

<i>The Question of Adherence pursued in respect to the Doctrine of good Works; with a Vindication of our Tenets on this Head.</i>	317
---	-----

## SECTION I.

<i>Concerning the Standard of Morals.</i>	317
---	-----

## SECTION II.

<i>Concerning the Sanctions of Morality.</i>	336
--	-----

<b>RECAPITULATORY CONCLUSION.</b>	342
-----------------------------------	-----

---

---

## INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

---

**I**T were happy for the Church of England, if, laying aside all curious disquisitions of impertinent truths, we would apply ourselves to the knowledge and maintenance of those only points which are necessary to salvation, and to the zealous practice of those things which we assuredly know." Were this position of the pious and amiable Bishop Hall universally adopted, the spirit of controversy among Christians would decrease, in proportion as the spirit of Christianity gained ground. Indeed, when the difference between those plainly revealed truths essential to salvation, and the speculative opinions of curious men, in points not so fully revealed as to authorize decided judgment upon them, is well considered, the conclusion drawn by sound reason and charity from the premises, must be this—that, whilst in the maintenance of those important truths which constitute the

distinguishing characteristics of our Profession, we are stedfast and immoveable; in all those points which are either unimportant or unnecessary to be determined, we should, by refraining from all pertinacity of opinion and severity of censure, let our "moderation be known unto all men."

It was well observed by the learned Erasmus, that there are many things which do no harm while they are neglected; but, when they are once stirred, raise up grievous tragedies in the world. So long as matters of private opinion are suffered to remain such, Christians may travel on in the same road to Heaven, as they ought, without falling out by the way. But when private opinions on either side are attempted to be made indispensable articles of faith, then discord begins; each party having an equal right of appeal to his own judgment, as the standard for decision.

Still, when it is considered, that whilst there may be diversities of opinions on some religious subjects, the same Christian spirit should universally prevail; it will be concluded, that it ought to be the endeavour of all Christians to draw as near to each other as may be in all controverted points; that the bond of peace between them may be preserved as unbroken as possible. This, it is presumed, would be generally effected, (and the experiment is surely at all times worth making,) if the same pains were but taken to understand the meaning of an author from whom we think we differ, as we all know and lament are too

often employed to misrepresent it. Happily, the fundamental truths necessary to salvation are clearly laid before us in the sacred pages. Towards these it is to be expected that all Christians should be zealously affected. But the misfortune is, that zeal and charity do not go together so often as they ought. The infirmity of the man is too apt to encroach upon the charity of the Christian: when this is the case, controversialists, forgetting that they are all brethren of the same Lord, are apt to push each other into extremes, into which they never meant to be carried; and thus by widening as it were the distance between themselves, render those differences of opinion irreconcilable, which sound reasoning and temperate discussion, in many cases, would prove to have been more imaginary than real.

Controversy in itself is certainly useful: when properly conducted, nothing tends so much to the elucidation of truth. But when it is made more subservient to passion than to reason; when prejudice is suffered to hold the scale of judgment, and railing is substituted for argument; we deprecate the use of it, from the consciousness of its abuse; and are contented to forego the advantage that may be derived from it, rather than purchase it at so dear a price as that of charity.

Such were the ideas which first presented themselves to my mind, on my reading a publication lately sent into the world by the Rev. J. OVERTON, under

the title of "The True Churchman ascertained." How far, or in what degree they apply to that publication, shall be left to my readers to judge. At the same time, I trust, that the spirit of these preliminary remarks, will so transfuse itself into the observations I may have to make on Mr. OVERTON's book, as to secure me from being condemned out of my own mouth. It is not my wish to detract in the least from the credit to which Mr. O. may be entitled for zeal, piety, or sincerity of intention; however I may occasionally consider him defective in the characteristics of a sound reasoner, not less than in the conduct of a candid divine. At the same time, therefore, that I shall feel pleasure in meeting Mr. O. in any page of his book, on that general ground of Christianity, on which we ought to meet, and lament the occasional difference of opinion that may still remain between us; it will be my object, to represent that difference of opinion as not affecting (unless improperly insisted upon) the essential interests of that cause, which both of us, as ministers of the same Church, ought to have equally at heart to promote.

For this purpose I shall, as occasion may require, oppose argument to argument, and statement to statement; and placing the scale of judgment in the only hands in which it ought to be placed, leave the turn of it, as far as may be, to the reader. Supposing him possessed of discrimination, he will be competent to judge how far the positions laid down by Mr. O.

have been substantiated; by considering how far the quotations adduced by him have been justly interpreted, his premises fairly stated, and his conclusions legitimately drawn.

Mr. O.'s publication appears to proceed on a different plan; little being left for the reader, but to coincide in judgment with its author. Now nothing we know can be more inconsistent with the established rule of justice, than that a man should be both witness and judge in his own cause. "And if in a civil judicature, there be required sworn and able judges, just laws, clear evidence, select jurors, recorded proceedings; how much more ought this to be expected in those pleas of religion which concern the eternal state of the soul, the safety of the Church, and the glory of our Creator and Redeemer?"

Yet this plan of self-awarding judgment; appears to be the plan on which almost every chapter of Mr. O.'s publication is manifestly constructed. The opinions in which the supposed opponents of Mr. O. are made to differ from him, are first brought before the reader; and after having been placed, by his own comments upon them, in that point of view, in which Mr. O. has been accustomed to see them; they are then consigned to the sentence, which it is the object of each chapter to leave impressed on the mind of its reader, of their being in a greater or less degree at variance with the evangelical doctrine.



To such treatment, had it concerned himself, Bishop Hall, it is probable, would have applied the language to be found in one of his chapters on Christian moderation. "What I will own, is mine; what is cast upon me, is mine adversary's. And if I by deductions be fetched into such error, the fault is not in my faith, but in my logick; my brain may err, my heart doth not. Away then with this unjust violence; let no man bear more than his own burthen: Press an erring brother, if ye please, in way of argument, with such odious consequences, as may make him weary of his opinion; but hate to charge him with it as his own: frame not imaginary monsters of error with whom you may contend."

Had any intelligent reader of Mr. O.'s publication delivered that decisive sentence that is to be found in page 397 of his work, where he says, by way of conclusion to his subject, "*We then are the true Churchmen*; and whatever astonishment certain critics may express at the affirmation, in a very fundamental and important sense of the word, Mr. Daubeny and his associates are *Dissenters* from the Church of England;"—I should have thought such sentence a subject for serious consideration. But when the sentence is considered as pronounced by the party supposed to be accused, against the party here made to stand in the character of accuser; no weight of evidence can attach to it; on the established principle, that in case of trial between two parties, what either party says for

himself to the crimination of his opponent, must, in the eye of judgment, pass for nothing more than assertion unproved, and perhaps incapable of proof.

The title Mr. O. has given to his work, is that of "The True Churchman ascertained; or an Apology for those of the Regular Clergy of the Establishment, who are sometimes called *Evangelical Ministers*."

This title appears to me objectionable on more accounts than one. The true Churchmanship of the regular Clergy of the Establishment no more requires to be ascertained, than do the *Evangelical Ministers* of the Established Church stand in need of an apology. All ministers of the established Church are professedly *Evangelical Ministers*; and woe be to them, if they do not preach in conformity to their profession. But if by *Evangelical Ministers* are to be understood chiefly, if not exclusively, those among the Clergy, who consider certain peculiarities of opinion to constitute part of the Gospel, which others think themselves justified in considering as peculiarities not to be maintained, and not worth contending about; the exclusive appropriation of a title to themselves, which implies a notorious dereliction of duty on the part of their opponents, is certainly not to be admitted. It is prejudging a cause, which remains yet to be tried. The professed object of Mr. O.'s publication being, in a degree at least, to plead the cause of Calvinism; the title of his book, if any distinction were necessary to be made between those who profess

to teach the same doctrine, should have been; "An Apology for those Regular Clergy of the Establishment, who maintain the Articles of the Church of England to be *Calvinistic*, in opposition to the great body of the Clergy who do not see them in that light." In such case an invidious distinction, respecting the essential object of their profession, between ministers of the same church would have been avoided; and the point at issue, as relating to a mere difference of opinion, would have been placed on its proper ground. Such a title would have conveyed a clear and intelligible meaning to every reader; and might possibly have led the author to a more perspicuous and systematic arrangement of his subject, than his publication at present exhibits. For the general fallacy which appears to pervade the whole of Mr. O.'s work, is occasioned by a want of proper discrimination having been made between the peculiar tenets of Calvinism, and those doctrines of grace, which our Articles were meant to secure. To have enabled his reader to form a proper judgment on these two distinct subjects, Mr. O. should have furnished him with particular definitions of what was to be understood under each of these heads; which might have prevented an association of ideas, which, to those who have been accustomed to precision of language, may not appear to have any legitimate connection.

But as every author has a right to treat his subject in his own way, it must be my object to meet Mr. O.'s publication on the ground on which he himself has placed it; at the same time that it will be my endeavour to do him all possible justice.

The preliminary observations to be found in the Preface, respecting the manner which Mr. O. professes to adopt in the prosecution of his work, cannot but be generally approved. "It is not (he says, page 4,) the writer's intention, that a single passage should be applied to any divine, who does not professedly hold the doctrine advanced in their works; or that they should be responsible for the doctrines of each other, any further than they professedly agree." A leading characteristic of the subject treated of by him being this, "to advance nothing without *proof*; to claim credit for nothing which is not either founded in argument, or supported by testimony; and in the use of his testimony, to admit of nothing at second hand, but to bring forward the vouchers to speak for themselves." Page 7. "And whatever is not proved by a whole body of evidence, rendered strong and invincible by the harmony and support of all its parts, and interpreted as it would be by plain honest men of sound understanding and sufficient information, shall be considered as not proved at all." P. 8. Such a mode of investigation will be admitted on all hands to promise most fairly for the attainment of

truth; at the same time that it “affords the best security against the iniquity of quotation itself.” P. 8.

In confidence that his publication has been conducted on this fair, unexceptionable, and commendable plan, Mr. O. therefore concludes his Preface with desiring, “that, on the one part and on the other, regard may be had to no *unsupported* charge; and that with what measure we meet, it may be measured to us again.” P. 8. To be tried by the spirit of the principles here laid down, no writer on whose publication Mr. O. has thought proper to sit in judgment, can object. It will remain to be determined by the reader, how far Mr. O.’s practice has corresponded with the justness of his theory. But to qualify him so to do, frequent appeal must necessarily be made to my own writings. On this head, then, I have to crave my reader’s indulgence. Indeed, how desirous soever I may be to speak little of myself, yet, considering that my writings, for reasons best known to Mr. O., appear to have ministered the greatest cause of offence; I know no other way by which effectual justice can be done, than that of suffering them to speak for themselves. Should they not, according to the plan of trial proposed by Mr. O., be found to contain the words of truth and soberness, let them, in God’s name, be rejected. In such case I shall only have to plead the principle and intention, by which the Author was

directed in the composition of them : and on this head, shall rest satisfied with the verdict which an honest mind will never fail to pronounce.

But I hope for more. Should not Mr. O. be more attached to *names* than to *things*, I hope that the investigation before me will lead to a conviction in his mind, that, on some subjects, his opinion has been more unqualified, and his decision more absolute, than mature judgment would have warranted. And when I consider, moreover, that, unless I have long laboured under the grossest deception, no Minister of the Church can with the true principles of the Establishment to be more respected, or can deem any thing to be more creditable, than “ to preach the real doctrines of the Church *in the Church*” than myself; I am strongly persuaded, that the supposed differences of opinion, on the essential doctrines of Christianity, between Mr. O. and myself, will not appear so irreconcilable as he has represented them. But should this not be the case, Mr. O. may depend upon it, I shall not consider myself justified in any attempt to sink his character in the world, by representing him in any other light, than that in which every Christian Minister would wish to see his brother, as zealous for the honour of that Master in whose service he is engaged.

The Calvinistic standard (as I have observed on a former occasion) is not the standard by which charity tells me to form a definitive judgment of my

Christian brethren: because, in the first place, the peculiarities of Calvinism do not belong to the essence of Christianity; they are *not necessary Catholic verities*, but merely matters of opinion, in which a man may err, or be ignorant, without danger to his soul: and in the second, because, in the number of those who have held them, and those who have held them not, are to be found some of the most spiritual members of the Christian church. Calvinism, therefore, may be considered as containing opinions, with respect to which the best of Christians may be allowed to differ, without any forfeiture of their Christian character, provided they break not the bond of charity in so doing.

My answer to Sir RICHARD HILL, has I trust, furnished proof, that no difference of opinion on controverted points can induce me to withhold from a pious and exemplary Christian, that respect to which he is justly entitled. What I may say on the present occasion, on the subject of Mr. O.'s publication, will not, I flatter myself, make me appear inconsistent with myself. But for the points in question; if they must be debated, they might surely be debated with more Christian temper. If it be truth we seek, and not victory, why take we not the counsel of St. Paul, “*αληθευειν εν αγαπη*,” to speak the truth in love?” Since our Church, after the example of the primitive, hath thought fit on these points to walk in a latitude, and to be sparing in her definitions, con-

fining herself, as far as possible, to the letter of scripture; why should not all her sons be wise unto sobriety, and let GOD alone with his secrets? Why may not our hearts be united, though our heads do differ? And above all, why do we not, as Christians, forbear all *capital* censures either way: which must needs involve many holy souls, many Catholic Bishops of the antient church, many learned and godly Doctors of our own; all of whom have differed in their opinions on these points, at the same time that they have been closely united in their affections? For my own part, to conclude with the words of the learned Dr. POTTER, "I honour truth with all my heart, next after GOD; or rather as I do GOD himself, who is the God of truth: and I shall esteem him my dearest friend, that shall at any time conquer my errors with evidence of truth; for that conquest shall be my happiness and victory. Any error abuseth the understanding, but an error in religion corrupts it; in faith, poisons it: how happy and glad shall I be to be purged of all such rust and poison! But I am a Christian, and rational; and still I must repeat it, I cannot be convinced but with scripture or reason: either of these, the former being grounded on the latter, will command my assent; but I cannot be chidden, or frightened, or forced into an opinion; one good argument sways me more than twenty declamations."\*

\* Letter of the learned Christopher Potter, D.D.





## CHAPTER I.

*The main Question stated, and argued against the Assailants, from their Conduct in Subscription; their own Concessions; and the Complaints of several eminent Bishops.*

AS preparatory to the due appreciation of Mr. OVERTON'S testimony, there is one remark which his mode of quoting has rendered necessary to be made; and which the reader will do well to keep constantly before him; namely, that every quotation, to be a just one, must be so applied as to speak the sense of the author from whom it is made; otherwise the meaning annexed to it, is not that for which the author is responsible.

The opening of the chapter before us calls for the immediate application of this remark. Mr. O. in p. 4 of his Preface, informs his reader, that "the divines, upon whose procedure the nature of the present undertaking renders it necessary to animadvert, are the *aggressors*. They have attacked *personally*, and by *name*, a number of individuals, who had taken no such liberty with them."

The charge thus regularly brought forward, the reader will of course expect to see substantiated.

My name appears in Mr. O.'s title-page among the number of those divines, against whom this charge is brought. As an accused party, therefore, I stand upon my defence, and appeal to the intelligent reader for judgment.

The title to this chapter leads the reader to expect the main question at issue between Mr. O.'s "Evangelical Ministers" and their supposed opponents to be "stated;" as a preliminary, necessary to prepare him to enter into the cause on which Mr. O. professes to sit in judgment; by qualifying him to ascertain the precise point, on which the merits of it turn. But by an immediate deviation from its title, the chapter sets out with the application of an unqualified charge to the case of Dr. CROFT; and from him proceeds to make it bear on the language of Mr. POLWHELE, Mr. HAGGITT, &c. together with a whole tribe of unnamed modern writers, "whose reasonings," Mr. O. says, "proceed on the supposition that the rest of the Clergy *do*, but that those regular Ministers of the Establishment (for whom Mr. O. professes to apologize) *do not* teach according to the established doctrines of our Church." p. 14. Mr. O. then proceeds.—"This," says he, "is in effect the proposition maintained by Mr. DAUBENY and his admirers, against the well-known objects of his strictures, Mr. WILBERFORCE and Mrs. MORE. The opinion Mr. W. has expressed respecting the difference between the actual and the pro-

ferred principles of many of the clergy, Mr. D. says, is unjust, and derived more from the indecent revilings of *irregular preachers* than from fact."

P. 14. Therefore, according to Mr. O.'s mode of reasoning, the proposition maintained by Mr. D. on this occasion is, that the *regular* Clergy of the Establishment, for whom his apology is made, do not preach the Gospel.

The passages here referred to by Mr. O. for the purpose of establishing his charge against the author of the "Guide to the Church," are to be found in pages 324 and 378 of that publication, to which, I hope, my readers will refer. To any one who has read, with the least degree of attention, the publication here referred to, the object of its writer will clearly appear to have been that of preventing, as far as he could, the increase of that separation from the Church of this country, which every true friend to our Establishment so sincerely deplures. With this object before me, every argument was made use of, that might tend to place our Church in the most eligible point of view in the eyes of the people; and at the same time to remove, as far as might be, those prejudices, which the language of separatists, from time to time, was calculated to create against it. And when it is considered, that my publication had its birth in my own parish, deriving its origin from observations made by myself on the actual condition of the people committed to my charge, it will

be concluded, that my references must have those parties principally in view, with whom I was personally connected, and for whose spiritual welfare I was more immediately concerned. In alluding, therefore, to the "indecent revilings of *irregular* preachers," I could not (if there be any meaning in words) be understood to mean the *regular* Ministers of the Establishment; but to have in my eye those *irregular* self-constituted preachers, who are now making their way into all parishes, under the assumed title of *Gospel Preachers*, and drawing away light-minded people from their parish churches, on the plausible ground that the Gospel is not preached in them.

Such is the state of my parish; and such I am inclined to think would continue to be the state of it, was Mr. O. himself to take the charge of it; whilst those "blue-apron'd men (as Bishop Hall calls them) abound among us, who, though they never knew any better school than their shop-board, yet think themselves more truly learned than the deepest Doctor, and better interpreters of scripture than the greatest divine." Mr. O. might have had a demonstrative proof that these *irregular* preachers were the persons I had in view on the occasion, by referring to p. 298 of the same discourse, from which the extract brought by Mr. O. for the purpose of substantiating the charge against me, as an accuser of the *regular* Ministers of the Establishment, has been made. In that page he would have found a note, the express

purpose of which was to furnish a specimen of the doctrine propagated by one of those self-constituted itinerant preachers, in the following words, communicated to me by a person who heard them delivered. "The regular Clergy," said he, "know nothing of Christianity; their whole preaching is *work, work*. They do not know you cannot work. You must wait your call, and, for your comfort I tell you, it is never too late. If on your sick bed you can call out on the name of Jesus; or groan Jesus, or even whisper Jesus with your last breath, you are safe."

A similar proof might also have been found in page 392 of the Appendix; where a reason given by a Gentleman for discontinuing his attendance at the Independent Chapel in Bath, was, that in consequence of the preacher's indecent railing against the bishops and clergy, he could not consider him to be a Minister of the Gospel of Peace. When, therefore, I observed in Mr. WILBRAFORCE's publication a general charge of insufficiency brought against the Clergy of the Establishment, I was desirous of counteracting the effect which a charge, supported by such respectable authority, might have on the public mind; as tending to confirm the opinion so industriously circulated by *irregular* preachers, for the purpose of promoting separation from the Church. With this idea, it was "submitted to the candour of this author, whether, in his laudable

zeal for the promotion of the Christian cause, the description which he had given of the present Clergy of our Church, *taking them as a body*, was not too strong, &c." Guide, p. 320. And whilst I felt "so strongly what the cause of genuine Christianity owes to the character and abilities of this author, as to give him full credit for the sincerity of his intention, it was still suggested to his consideration, whether a description of the state of our Church, as destitute of the vital spirit of Christianity, in consequence of the genuine principles of it not being inculcated by its pastors, who, in their collective character, are represented as 'having forsaken the fountain of living water, and hewed them out cisterns, which can hold no water,' be not a description, in the present day when establishments possess such little hold on the human mind, which may do harm; by putting a notion into the minds of inconsiderate people not easy to be eradicated, and thereby preventing the Clergy from doing that good, which the majority of them, I trust, are still well-disposed to do." P. 323. Then follows the sentence from which Mr. O. has made his extract, as applicable to those *regular* Ministers of the Establishment whose cause he pleads. "For," continues the Author of the Guide, "it may be asked, to what such a description of the insufficiency of our Clergy (derived more from the indecent revilings of *irregular* preachers than from fact) must lead, when accom-

panied with that notorious ignorance of the nature of the Christian Church, which now so universally prevails, but to a more general separation from its communion than we now deplore?"

I had really considered myself on this occasion in the character of an advocate for the collective body of the Clergy, against a charge which to me appeared both unjust, impolitic, and uncharitable: unjust, because, as a general charge, it cannot be supported by facts; impolitic, because in its effect it must prove detrimental to the Constitution of this country; and uncharitable, as exposing a most useful body of men to rash, random, and indiscriminate censure. To Mr. O. it seems, I appear in a very different light. With what degree of justice the reader is left to determine; whilst I pass on to the consideration of the next proof, brought from my writings for the purpose of substantiating the charge against me.

"In his Letter to Mrs. MORE, after quoting the words both of Mrs. MORE and Mr. WILBERFORCE respecting the union between the doctrines and duties of Christianity, Mr. D. observes, But, Madam, this is not the language either of the scriptures, or of the Church of England."—P. 14. The union between the doctrines and duties of Christianity is *one thing*; the *indivisible* union between them is *another*. Now as the *indivisibility* of the union in this case constituted my ground of objection to Mrs. MORE's



position, and as the word *indivisible* is to be found in the page referred to by Mr. O., it should not have been kept back from the reader, because this is not suffering a writer to speak his own language. How far Mr. O.'s practice in this instance corresponds with the theory laid down in his Preface, where he points out the necessity of guarding against "*the iniquity of quotations*," the reader will judge. But this subject is passed over for the present, because it will be handled in its proper place. The force of Mr. O.'s proof, as drawn from the quotation in question, is what is now to be examined.

If, then, Mrs. M. had affirmed, that those regular Clergy of the Establishment, whose cause Mr. O. advocates, did maintain the position she had laid down relative to the *indivisible* union of the doctrines and duties of Christianity, to be the genuine tenet of the Church of England; or that it was admitted to be such by all Calvinistic ministers of the Church; by saying to Mrs. M. that this was not the language either of the scriptures or of the Church of England, I might be considered as having *indirectly* charged the *regular* Ministers in question, with not reaching in this instance according to the established doctrine of our Church. But how the rejection of a position held by Mrs. M., on the ground of its not being warranted, in my judgment, by the language either of scripture or of the Church, considered simply in itself, can furnish Mr. O. with a proof in

point on this occasion, is what I have not sufficient penetration to discern; unless the following inference from it be admitted to be a just one:—That to maintain that Mrs. M. has published what to me appears to be an erroneous position, is in effect to say, that the regular Clergy, whom Mr. O. distinguishes by the title of Evangelical Ministers, do not teach according to the doctrines of our Church. But this inference must be grounded on the admission, that the position in question constitutes what the Ministers under consideration maintain to be a part of those doctrines. The position in question, however, was not considered by me with an eye either to those Ministers or to Calvinism; but with an eye only to the general tenor of the doctrine of the Apostle, on whose authority it was apparently built; if, therefore, my judgment upon it must be construed into a charge against Mr. O.'s Clergy, it is of his own making, and consequently a charge for which the maker of it is alone responsible.

Admitting, indeed, this charge to be just, as Mr. O.'s application of it might fairly lead the reader to conclude, the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers appear to have been more quick-sighted than myself upon this occasion, by representing this position of Mrs. M. to be "Calvinism in disguise." Leaving, however, my reader to trace out for himself, if he can, the *necessary* connection between my judgment of the

position in question and the charge it is here brought to substantiate, I proceed.

The next quotation from my writings brought for the purpose of proving the proposition which I am considered to maintain, namely, that the *regular* Clergy, whose cause Mr. O. advocates, “do not teach according to the established doctrines of our Church, is taken from p. 622 of the Appendix to the Guide. To this part of my writings, therefore, the reader will now direct his attention.

To ascertain the genuine sense of an author in any given part of his writings, two things, it is presumed, are necessary; first, that it be known to whom, or on what occasion, the author writes; and in the next place, the subject which the author had immediately before him in the part to which reference is made. A proper attention to these leading circumstances in composition would have prevented at least half the controversy that has taken place in the world; and, if I mistake not, would have contributed in no inconsiderable degree to the abridgment of Mr. O.’s publication.

The quotation here adduced by Mr. O. is taken from the concluding Letter to Sir Richard Hill; and refers to that part of Sir Richard’s Letters to me, in which the author recommends my attendance on some Teachers officiating in a state of actual separation from the Church of England, for the purpose of qualifying me to preach the sound doctrines of

the Gospel; concluding with observing to me, that “it is much to be lamented, on my own account,” that I do not suffer myself to reap the benefit of their ministry. Among these teachers, Mr. JAY, minister of an Independent Congregation in Bath, and a Mr. GREEN, who had set up an Independent Chapel of his own, as I understand, in the same place, were recommended by name “as sound and steady members of the Church,”

To such recommendation my answer was obvious; “that I was sorry Sir Richard had not found a tutor for me in the Church of England; but having learnt that we must not do evil that good may come, I could not think the advantage to be obtained by my attendance on Mr. JAY’s ministry, would compensate for the sin I should commit in becoming a member of a schismatic congregation.” Appendix, p. 389. Now, when it is considered, that Sir Richard Hill professedly maintains the tenets of Calvinism, as constituting an essential part of the doctrines of Grace; and that my writings have been offensive to him on account of their not coming up to that standard, which he considers as a touchstone by which Evangelical doctrines are to be tried; the obvious conclusion to be drawn from his recommendation of some particular teachers for my instructors was, that I should receive a lesson on that *particular* subject, in which, according to Sir Richard’s standard of perfection, I was judged to be defective.

When, therefore, in my concluding Letter I took occasion, by way of refreshing the reader's memory, briefly to recapitulate the subjects which before had been particularly handled; I brought forward a passage from Sir Richard's publication, in which he "beseeches me to lay aside my prejudices against salvation by Grace, and the preachers of it," my attention, it is obvious, must have been directed to those preachers pointed out to my immediate notice by Sir Richard as persons from whom I might so essentially benefit. With these preachers therefore in view, I remarked, in answer to Sir Richard's recommendation, that "it was one of the hackneyed phrases of the day, calculated to lead weak people by the ear, and draw them away from the Establishment; that the Clergy of the Church were not Gospel Ministers." Whilst on the presumption that the Ministers of Sir Richard's recommendation maintained the same doctrines with himself, I proceeded to observe, that those "whom he distinguished by the exclusive title of Preachers of Salvation by Grace, should rather be called Preachers of absolute Decrees, Predestination, Election, and Faith without Works." I then go on to say, in allusion to those irregular and itinerant preachers, whose general practice it is to draw people away from the Establishment, by speaking disrespectfully of its ministers; — "To spread or preach the Gospel, has of late years become a favourite topic with a certain class

of people, who would fain have it believed, that without them there would be no more Gospel in Britain than among the wildest Indians. But till you have proved the peculiar tenets of Calvinism to be the doctrines of the Bible, (which I am inclined to think you never will) you must excuse me, if I do not subscribe to the truth of that title, which your favourite preachers arrogate to themselves."—Appendix, p. 622.

If my reader will now take the trouble to compare the above passage, as it stands, in my writings, with the one Mr. O. has given to his reader as taken from the p. 622 of my Appendix, he will perceive that my language has not only been unfaithfully reported, but also improperly applied. Had the words in my book been, what Mr. O. has thought proper to give for mine in the 15th. page of his publication, they might perhaps have been considered as designed to refer to those ministers, whose cause Mr. O. pleads. "*Gospel Ministers*," it is true, are words to be found in the passage referred to; but in connection with the words which Mr. O. has made to precede them, namely, "*those who are distinguished Gospel Ministers*," a connection which, to cursory readers, gives the passage the appearance of referring to Mr. OVERTON's *Evangelical Ministers*; the words are not to be found. In fact, the passage taken apparently from my writings, and for which I am made responsible in the judgment of Mr. O.'s

readers, does in his edition of it convey a meaning totally different from that intended to be conveyed by its author. The first part of it, in its original and unadulterated state, the reader will readily perceive, was not meant to refer to any distinction that might prevail among the regular Clergy themselves; but was exclusively expressive of the opinion propagated by *irregular* preachers, relative to the insufficiency of the Clergy at large, for the purpose of drawing away hearers from the Established Church. Whilst the latter part of the passage which Mr. O. has applied to those distinguished Gospel Ministers, against whom I am supposed to have been writing, as preachers of absolute decrees, &c. applies, according to its most obvious sense in my page, not to the Clergy of the Establishment, but to preachers of that *irregular* kind whom Sir Richard had particularly recommended to my notice.

A very moderate share of discernment might, it is presumed, have enabled Mr. O. to discriminate between his edition of my language on this occasion, and my own. Should he, therefore, through an over degree of eagerness to substantiate his charge, have inadvertently made me the traducer of his brethren, I have only to say, "*Qui capit ille facit.*" If a cap have thereby been put on the heads of those Ministers whose cause he pleads, which evidently was not made for them, Mr. O. certainly has but himself to blame, should it hurt them in the wearing.

Having thus stated the case, and I trust fairly, the reader will judge how far in this instance also Mr. O. has been governed by the principles laid down in his Preface. How far, "in what is here given as a quotation from my writings, the words of the author have been carefully distinguished," and "the iniquity of quotation guarded against." P. 8.

To confirm the idea, however, which it appears to have been the object of Mr. OVERTON to establish, and thereby make up as it were in the gross what might prove defective in the detail, he concludes his extracts from my pages with the following general character of my publications; which, as I stop not at *little things*, I shall leave to have its own weight with my reader:—"In short, (says Mr. O.) to prove the *heresy* of persons of this description, and his own *churchmanship*, he has favoured the world with several volumes." P. 15.

The next ground Mr. O. takes, and on which he appears to tread with confidence, relates to the subscription to Articles; in which his reader is given to understand, that a marked distinction between the Clergy whom he represents and their supposed opponents, ranged under the names of Doctors Paley, Hay, Croft, Daubeny, &c. is to be traced. With this view, a variety of references are brought forward from the publications of different authors, for the purpose of proving what their sentiments were on the subject of subscription. And then from the



general tenor of these references, as tending to countenance a dishonest and jesuitical subscription to our established Formulary, a conclusion is drawn, which Mr. O.'s readers are at least indirectly taught to apply to the great body of Clergy, whom Mr. O. distinguishes under the title of his *opponents*.

Previous to the investigation of this implied charge, it may be proper to recal to the reader's notice one principle, on which Mr. O. in his Preface professes to proceed in the publication before him, contained in the following words: "Nor is it the writer's intention, that a single passage should be applied to any divine, who does not *professedly* hold the doctrine advanced in their works; or that they should be responsible for the doctrines of each other, any further than they *professedly* agree." P. 4. With this equitable principle, that part of Mr. O.'s publication under immediate consideration, appears to be in direct hostility. For it may be asked, what have the different sentiments, on the subject of subscription, of Doctors Paley, Hey, Croft, Balguy, Powell; of Bishops Warburton, Shipley, Watson; or twenty other celebrated divines of our Church, to do with any but themselves, or persons who have *professedly* made those sentiments their own by adoption? These sentiments furnish, indeed, proof of what we are sorry to see proved; but then it is a proof *ex hominibus*, and concerns only the individuals to whom it applies, and so far only as the fair in-

interpretation of their writings may justify the application; but do not contribute in the least to the establishment of the conclusion, for the support of which they have been apparently brought forward. Because Drs. PALEY, &c. Bishop WARBURTON, or WATSON, may have written loosely or incautiously on the subject of our Articles; to make a proof drawn from this circumstance, which bears upon them, bear also upon other divines, who may possibly no more approve of their writings in this respect than Mr. O. himself, is to act in the direct teeth of Mr. O.'s own principle, by which it is established, that "divines should not be responsible for the doctrines of each other, any further than they professedly agree."

The ground on which Mr. O. has built his conclusion, from the writings of the above-mentioned authors, as applicable to the general case of those divines whom he considers in the character of opponents, appears to be this—That all of the Clergy who do not see the Articles of our Church in the same *Calvinistic* point of view in which he sees them, cannot subscribe to them in their plain and grammatical sense; and that, therefore, the object they have before them, in consequence of such equivocal subscription, is, in Mr. O.'s words, "to evade or extenuate" some of the visible doctrines which the Articles are considered to contain. But as this is *assumed* ground, it is that on which no fair argu-

ment will stand. To any argument Mr. O. has placed or may place on such ground, it is sufficient to reply, that those divines who do not consider the Articles to be, strictly speaking, *Calvinistic*, profess to subscribe to them in the same sense in which Mr. O. supposes they cannot subscribe to them, namely, in their plain and grammatical sense. To insinuate that they do not, is in effect to lead the reader to the conclusion, that by far the majority of the Clergy of the Church of England are not honest men. This, of all the modes of controversy, is, undoubtedly, one of the most dishonest. In justice, therefore, to Mr. O.'s character, and in conformity with that equitable principle upon which he professes to write, it must be concluded, that, in his zeal for the maintenance of the cause he had in hand, he did not sufficiently consider how far conclusions drawn from the writings of certain individual divines, even in the indirect application of them to that great body of the Clergy against whom he writes, were calculated to lead his reader.

But if such conclusions, applicable only to the individuals from whose premises they are drawn, do not tend in the least to mark that characteristic line of distinction between Mr. O.'s Evangelical Ministers, and the great remaining body of the Clergy, whose respective opinions on the subject of our Articles, Mr. O. is here attempting to oppose to each other, (a point, in which, it is presumed, all persons

possessing a precision of ideas sufficient to enable them to draw a legitimate inference from any given argument, must be agreed;) they contribute nothing to the advancement of the particular object Mr. O. appears to have had in view, in bringing them before his reader.

To attempt to vindicate the general character of the Clergy, whom Mr. O. considers as his opponents, from the prejudice which his mode of reasoning may tend to create in his reader's mind, would be to pay them the worst of compliments; for it would be to suppose that such vindication was necessary. I therefore proceed to state briefly the complaint which, in my character as an individual, I have to bring against Mr. O.'s want of discrimination on this occasion.

If the reader will take the trouble of referring to the Postscript to the Clergy, at the conclusion of the "Guide to the Church," he will find a great part of fifty pages taken up in exposing the loose reasoning of Bishops Warburton, Hoadley, and Dr. Paley, on the subject of Creeds and Confessions. In answer to their complaints against the mysteriousness and abstruseness of some of our Articles, and to their proposals, that all unnecessary Articles should be retrenched, and subscription made more simple and easy, upon the idea that, in its present strict state, "it checks inquiry, and violates liberty;" I say, p. 430, that where there is no obligation to subscribe,

subscription cannot be considered to violate liberty: all that is required in this case being, that he who does subscribe, shall do it *ex animo*, as an honest man: plain language, which admits of no ambiguous interpretation. Whilst, in answer to Dr. PALEY's complaint, "that Creeds and Confessions ensnare the consciences of the Clergy, by holding out temptation to prevarication," my observation is, that a respect for the body should have withheld such a supposition. The fair inference from which observation is, that, in my judgment, it was a disgrace to my brethren to be supposed capable of prevarication on such an occasion. "For my own part," I proceeded to say, "I did not prevaricate on this subject, and charity bids me hope that every one of my brethren can say the same." P. 431.

My reader will probably conclude, that such a part of my writings could not possibly have escaped the notice of a person, who scrutinized them so narrowly as Mr. O. appears to have done. My observations on the writings of Bishops HOADLEY, WARBURTON, and Dr. PALEY, constituted that prominent feature in my Postscript to the Clergy, most likely to arrest the attention of a brother clergyman. Admitting that Mr. O. has read my book with the least degree of regularity and observation, (and if he have not, his judgment upon it must be appreciated accordingly) he must have known that my sentiments on the subject of subscription accorded

with his own. To withhold evidence then from his reader, which directly militated against the conclusion which he was endeavouring to make bear, indirectly at least, against that body of Clergy of which I was made a nominal representative, was certainly not to do me that justice, as an individual, to which Mr. O. must know me to be entitled: it was, in fact, adding to the transgression of his own principle, according to which "divines were not to be made responsible for the doctrines of each other any further than they professedly agreed;" the injustice of not giving me credit even for the contents of my own writings. The motive Mr. O. might have for withholding the evidence in question, I take not upon me to ascertain. Having pointed out the fact to my reader's notice, I proceed.

The question Mr. O. places before his readers in p. 17, as that which his publication was expressly designed to answer, is this—"Whose doctrines are really those of our Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy? The doctrines of the Evangelical Ministers, whose cause Mr. O. pleads, or the doctrines of their supposed opponents, classed under the heads mentioned in Mr. O.'s title page?" As a leading circumstance to determine this question, the supposed difference of conduct of each party respecting subscription is first pointed out. After several pages spent in references to the writings of individual divines, who appear to have written loosely and unjustifiably on

the subject of subscription, Mr. O. winds up this chapter with a variety of respectable authorities; which, it is presumed, are brought forward for the purpose of contributing their assistance to the support of the position, which the chapter is meant to establish. "Who would expect," says Mr. O. p. 34, "any thing in support of our position from our very warm opponents, the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers?"—The position meant to be established is, that the Clergy, for whom Mr. O. pleads, do preach the genuine doctrines of the Articles, and that their supposed opponents do not. To substantiate this position, which constitutes a chief subject of the present chapter, the testimonies of the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers, of the late Mr. JONES, of Archbishop SECKER, Bishop of LONDON, Bishop HORSLEY, Bishop HORNE, and the Bishop of DURHAM, to which is added that of the Bishop of LINCOLN, in support of an honest subscription to our Articles, are brought forward.

Having ranged this respectable authority before his reader, Mr. O. thus proceeds upon it: p. 42. "And is there, after all, no *ground* for this complaint? Do not these distinguished heads and champions of the Church, after the most diligent view, *understand* the subject? or are they guilty of '*gross* misrepresentation?' Is this the raving of enthusiasm? or will the British Critic, and Mr. Daubeny, call this 'the reviling of sectaries?' Men may, indeed,

say what they please, and when they please *contradict* at one time what they *affirm* at another. Thus, however, does it appear, that one class of these divines in *vindicating* such a conduct, another in *confessing* it, and our bishops in *lamenting* it, conspire to *establish the fact*, in opposition to our assailants, that *many* of them have not adhered to the *obvious doctrines of the Articles*; or, in other words, do not preach *so evangelically* as these forms. And thus, on the other hand, do *we* profess to adhere to their *plain meaning*; thus it is *confessed*, that the Articles lean to our side of the question; and thus do these eminent Prelates recommend, with all their energy, the very style of preaching by which we are characterized, for which we are calumniated, and which only we would here vindicate." P. 42.

This formal parade of premises, proof, and inference, is calculated to leave an impression on the reader's mind, that Mr. O. having regularly made out his case, is, therefore, justified in his conclusion. But to me it appears, that, at least, two, if not three, links are evidently wanting in the chain of argument, to connect Mr. O.'s premises with his conclusion. First, with respect to the premises themselves, before they can be admitted as contributing any thing towards the establishment of the general position Mr. O. is here attempting to make out, it must be proved, that the great body of Clergy, against whom Mr. O. is writing, adopt the loose sentiments of



those individual divines he has brought forward on the subject of subscription. In the next place it must be proved, that the authorities appealed to by Mr. O. on this occasion do actually bear on the case in point; by being intended to apply to *Evangelical* Ministers of the *Calvinistic persuasion*, to the exclusion of all others of a different persuasion. And, in the third place, it must be proved, in reference to the adduced authority of the Bishop of LINCOLN, which maintains what every honest man must, that the "Articles are to be subscribed in their plain obvious sense;"—that no Minister but those who consider the Articles to be *Calvinistic*, can subscribe them in that sense.

But the testimonies here brought together by Mr. O. tend only to substantiate *this general position*, which ought certainly to be the standard by which all Ministers of CHRIST should measure their professional labours, namely, that *heathen* morality ought not to be suffered to usurp the place of *Evangelical doctrine* in a Christian pulpit; in other words, that Christian Ministers must necessarily be *Gospel* Ministers. A pregnant testimony in support of this incontrovertible position, had Mr. O. thought proper, might have been taken from the "Guide to the Church." The reader will find it in p. 485, where, speaking of the Clergy of our Church, with the view of animating them to a zealous discharge of their important trust, I write thus: "But above

all, their object must be to take away all just reason for the desertion of their Ministry, by giving full proof of their *Evangelical* commission. With the Apostle, they must be able to say to their hearers, ‘ we take you to record this day, that we are pure from the blood of all men; for we have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.’ The plea generally advanced by modern separatists, that sound doctrine is not preached in our Church, upon how partial ground soever it may really stand, must at all events be effectually removed. For the people must not only be taught, that it is their duty to live in communion with the Church; they must, moreover, be satisfied, that they shall be profited by that communion. In a matter of this importance, men will take the liberty to judge for themselves: and if they have reason to think that they are not fed with the *true bread of life* within the walls of the Church, they will unquestionably seek it where they fancy it may be found, either in fields or in conventicles.” Now as the testimonies produced by Mr. O., were evidently meant to establish a position for the general application of the Clergy, but not to ascertain that line of discrimination between the class of Ministers whose cause Mr. O. advocates, and their supposed opponents, they certainly prove nothing to the point which they are brought to establish. And, as the testimony of the Bishop of LINCOLN, relative to subscription, is of the same general kind, and designed

for the same general application, it therefore can contribute no more towards Mr. O.'s immediate purpose, than do the testimonies which have been already referred to; of which the reader will have no doubt on his mind, when he takes this consideration into the account, that the Bishop, whose authority is here brought forward in support of an honest unequivocal subscription, is at the same time no advocate for that *Calvinistic* interpretation which Mr. O. maintains. When Mr. O., therefore, shall have proved, that what "these distinguished heads and champions of our Church understand," on the subject of our Articles, corresponds with *his own* sentiments on that subject; and that what the British Critic, or Mr. D. have said relative to the "*revilings of sectaries*," was intended to apply to those respectable authorities, which Mr. O. has thus ingeniously pressed into his service; the questions which Mr. O. asks, with such apparent confidence, together with the conclusion built upon them, in p. 42 and 43 of his publication, will be in some degree to his purpose, and not before.

Giving my reader credit, therefore, for a moderate share of that precision of ideas, which is so essential an ingredient in all good reasoning; he will have no difficulty, after what has been said, in appreciating either the validity of Mr. O.'s premises on this occasion, or the logic of his conclusion.

## CHAPTER II.

*“ The real Sense of the Articles, and Doctrines of our Reformers, investigated, and appealed to on the Question.”*

### SECTION I.

*“ The true Interpretation sought from our different Forms, as they illustrate and explain each other; the Title and Preamble annexed to the Articles; the Circumstances and Object of our Reformers; their other PUBLICK and approved Writings; and the Authorities they respected.”*

**B**EFORE we enter on the subject of the present chapter, as designed to contribute to the support of Mr. O.'s general position, in favour of those Evangelical Ministers, who consider the Articles of our Church to be *Calvinistic*, against the great body of Clergy of a different persuasion; it may be necessary to lay down some few *data*, which may constitute a kind of standard, by which the judgment of the parties, who appear to hold opinions contrary to each other, may be tried. An agreement upon terms, as tending to the abridgment of controversy, is, on that account, most desirable; for, it is presumed, that few men of understanding delibe-

rately enter into a dispute merely for disputing sake. When, indeed, the passions are engaged, and prejudices set afloat, it too often happens, that points are maintained both against reason and conviction, which the parties themselves, in their cooler moments, and under different circumstances, would have never thought it necessary to support. But for such cases the infirmity of human nature must plead excuse, from which it has been found, that the greatest minds, and the best of Christians, are not totally exempt.

Whoever, for instance, considers the futile objections brought forward by BAXTER, for the purpose of justifying his non-conformity to the re-establishment of our Church discipline at the Restoration, as they have been exposed by Bishop STILLINGFLEET, and other writers; will conclude, in justice to BAXTER's memory, that he himself, had he at the time been in a disposition of mind to have weighed them in the scale of sound reason, would have been ashamed to produce them.

Before, then, we enter upon the precise determination of a point, upon which the opinions of Christians have been more or less divided for upwards of the last two centuries, relative to the Calvinistic interpretation of our Articles, in order to shorten our process, and to arrive, as far as may be, at distinct ideas on this controverted subject, it will be proper that we commence our inquiry with a definition of what is to be understood by *Calvinism*.

Under the term *Calvinism*, then, it must be understood, are comprehended, not those Evangelical doctrines which J. CALVIN held in common with our Reformers, but those peculiar tenets which may be considered as originating in a great measure with himself, and derived their chief authority from his writings. It has been, I am inclined to think, for want of a proper discrimination having been made between the doctrines of Grace and Calvinistic doctrines, properly so called, that so much confusion has from time to time crept into this subject, that it is become impossible at all times, to ascertain the precise ideas meant to be conveyed by the parties engaged in this controversy; a circumstance which tends to render all accommodation between them hopeless.

To terminate a dispute between parties on any given subject, an acknowledged standard of appeal must be set up, by which the matter is to be determined. This is the only way to prevent loose and random reasoning, by making the arguments adduced bear on some certain decided point. But previously to the establishment of such a standard, the disputants must be so far agreed as to annex a certain precise definition to the subject, which constitutes the ground of difference between them; that their readers may have it in their power to determine their own judgment on the case, by measuring the arguments on each side by the standard set up for the purpose. But if the writers have not themselves

clear and precise ideas on the subject they profess to handle, it is impossible that they should convey those ideas to their readers. And from a subject upon which no clear and precise ideas have been formed, no legitimate conclusion can be drawn.

How far the foregoing observation applies to the indiscriminate manner in which Mr. O. has treated his subject in the Chapter before us, I shall leave my reader to determine for himself; and shall proceed to mark out that precise standard, by which the supposed conformity of our Articles to the Calvinistic model is to be ascertained.

The tenets which peculiarly distinguish the religious system of J. CALVIN, as they are to be found in his writings, are these following:—The absolute and unconditional Election, or Predestination, of certain particular individuals, to eternal salvation; and the equally absolute and unconditional reprobation of all the remaining part of mankind, without respect of persons. As preparatory to this divine act of Predestination, taken in this *absolute* and *unconditional* sense, it is maintained, that GOD fore-ordained the fall of Man.\* That in consequence of his fall, the whole human race, becoming a mass of corruption, it was decreed by GOD, before the foundation of the world, to choose some out of this mass to be saved, and to leave the others to ever-

\* “Arcanum Dei consilium, quo præordinatus fuerat hominis lapsus.” Calv. de Præd. p. 607.

lasting misery.\* This is what CALVIN calls that eternal decree of GOD, by which the final condition of every individual was determined before he was born into the world.† For all, (says he) are not created under the same circumstances; but to some eternal life is pre-ordained, to others eternal damnation.‡ And the occasion of this difference between the *elect* and the *reprobate* is resolved solely into the arbitrary will of GOD.§

Such are the fundamental principles on which the Calvinistic system rests; which Mr. O. says, p. 355, “are *incontrovertible*. For had not (continues Mr. O.) the glorious Being, who created the world, a right to create it for what purposes he pleased?”

To the foregoing fundamental principles must be added some tenets, which appear to be inseparably connected with them, respecting the *irresistibility* of divine Grace, the absolute impossibility of the elect falling from Grace; and a third, respecting GOD being the sole operator in the work of man’s salvation; man being only a machine or instrument in

\* “Deum ex perdita massa eligere et reprobare, &c.” Ib. p. 613.

† “Æternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit, quid de *unoquoque* homine fieri vellet.” Calv. Instit. l. iii. c. 21. 5.

‡ “Non enim pari conditione creantur omnes; sed aliis vita eterna, aliis damnatio æterna præordinatur.

§ “Nec absurdum videri debet, Deum non modo primi hominis casum, et in eo posterorum ruinam prævidisse sed *arbitrio* quoque suo *dispensasse*.” Instit. l. iii. c. 23. 7.



his hand; which, together with one additional tenet, compleats the horrid picture, which Calvin has given of that Being, whose mercy, we are told, is over all his works; namely, that part of the Divine plan of redemption consists in actually fitting and preparing the reprobate for the doom to which they have been consigned, by rendering them absolutely incapable of being profited by any means of Grace whatever: So that whilst the *elect* are prepared by God for glory, by his working all in them; so in like manner, the *reprobates* are prepared by God for damnation, by his rendering them blind, stupid, and depriving them of the faculty of hearing his word, to any possible advantage.\*

Such are the prominent doctrines of Calvinism, strictly so called, with which it is necessary the reader should be acquainted, previously to his entering on the subject brought before him in the present chapter, that he may be qualified to judge, how far the Church of England is answerable for their propagation. The reader will find the authority for the above shocking and unscriptural doctrines in the marginal references to Calvin's writings. In-

\* "Quemadmodum suæ erga electos vocationis efficacia salutem, ad quam eos æterno consilio destinarat, perficit Deus; ita sua habet adversus reprobos judicia, quibus consilium de illis suum exequatur. Quos ergo in vitæ contumeliam et mortis exitium creavit, ut iræ suæ organa forent, et severitatis exempla, eos, ut in finem suum perveniant, nunc audiendi verbi sui facultate privat, nunc ejus prædicatione magis excæcat et obstupefacit." Inst. l. iii. c. 24. 12.

deed, whoever would read Calvin's commentary on the Romans, and his Institutes of the Christian religion, particularly the 24th chapter of the 3d book, would not, it is presumed, be very ambitious of being considered a disciple of a master, who maintained, that, with respect to the elect, neither *faith* nor *good works* had any thing to do with their election; and as for the reprobate, "that God directs his voice to them, but for the purpose of their being made more deaf; that He sets his light before them, but in order that they may be rendered more blind; that He holds forth doctrine to them, but that they may be rendered more stupid by it; that He applies a remedy, but for the purpose of their not being healed." "*Vocem ad eos dirigit, (Deus) sed ut magis obsurdefcant; lucem accendit, sed ut reddantur ceciores; doctrinam profert, sed quâ magis obstupescant; remedium adhibet, sed ne sanentur.*"

In bringing forward these characteristic doctrines of Calvinism, it is not to be understood, that I mean to say, such are the precise doctrines maintained by Mr. O., and the Evangelical Ministers, whose cause he has undertaken; but my object in so doing is, that my reader might be furnished with a standard, by which he will be able to determine for himself, upon the propriety with which the doctrines of the Church of England can, in any accurate sense of the word, be called *Calvinistic*. On a subject which has been so frequently and largely discussed, it would

be easier perhaps to write a volume than a single chapter. For the difficulty an author has to contend with, in this case, arises not from any scantiness of materials, but from the necessity of a judicious selection. It will be my object, therefore, to compress what is to be said into the smallest compass, by confining myself, as much as possible, to the ground Mr. O. has taken.

From the title prefixed to this chapter, the reader is led to expect, that the articles of our church, and the different forms of our service, were to be brought together for the mutual illustration and explanation of each other. And this, it must be confessed, appears to be the most obvious, as well as expeditious, method of determining the point in question. But Mr. O. holds out an expectation to his reader in the title, which the chapter itself is not calculated to fulfil. He gives him to understand, that in the chapter on which he is entering, "the true interpretation of the Articles is sought from our different forms, as they illustrate and explain each other;" at the same time he takes care not to seek such interpretation, by avoiding the comparison proposed to be made for the purpose. As Mr. O. did not think proper to fulfil this important engagement with his reader, which would, in a manner, have brought the subject into a nutshell, and saved Mr. O. the trouble of writing many pages; it is to be expected, that he should be desirous of

getting off this ground, with as much expedition as possible. In place of that proof, therefore, which the reader had been taught to expect on this occasion, Mr. O. substitutes *assertion*; the admission or non-admission of which remains to be determined by the sense it is intended to convey—"The Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of our Church, (says Mr. O.) are three different species of writings. They were composed at different times, and in some respects, for different purposes. And yet, in *point of doctrine*, they uniformly breathe the same spirit, and express themselves with the same degree of force. No one of them contracts the ideas, or by any means lessens the import of the rest; but when compared with honesty, and understood according to the common rules of interpreting written compositions, each mutually illustrates and confirms the full and natural sense of the others." P. 45.

The exact harmony subsisting between the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of the Church of England is what was to be expected, and, as a general position, must be admitted on all hands. It constituted the very ground of the argument brought forward in p. 211 of the Appendix to the Guide, where I say, "that our Reformers, if we give them credit for sound sense and consistency of character, did not mean, in the system of divinity which they laid down in our Articles and Liturgy, to contradict themselves; and that our Church, consequently, in

the subscription to her Articles, does not require a profession of faith from her Clergy, different from that which they are taught to preach, in the use of the established Liturgy." In conformity with which reasoning, no one should take upon him so to expound an article, as either to make it contradict itself, or be incompatible with any other of the articles; or so as to make the Church be inconsistent with herself, in requiring us either to act or declare any thing contrary to what we subscribe.

In the general position brought forward on this occasion, both Mr. O. and myself are perfectly agreed. But how far this acknowledged position tends to establish the conclusion, to which each of us as writers designed that it should lead, is the point to be proved. For this purpose, considering that the establishment of the Calvinistic sense of our Articles was one object of Mr. O.'s publication, the comparison here proposed to have been instituted between the Articles and the different forms of our church service, should by him have been carried into effect, with an eye to that relation. The deficiency, however, of Mr. O.'s publication in this respect, on which my reader is left to form his own opinion, has been amply supplied by a late publication, under the title of "*the Articles of the Church of England proved not to be Calvinistic,*" by the Rev. the Dean of PETERBOROUGH; who, professing to meet Mr. O., and all Calvinistic writers,

on the ground laid down in the opening of the chapter before us, relative to the harmony subsisting between the Articles and services of our Church; has proved to demonstration, by the only method by which such a point is to be proved, namely, by a regular and systematic comparison of the respective compositions in question with the peculiar tenets of J. CALVIN; that the Articles of our Church, so far from being *Calvinistic*, do, in many of their prominent features, most decidedly militate against those tenets, to which the epithet *Calvinistic* is strictly appropriated.

To detain my reader as little as possible, on a subject which appears to be too plain to admit of controversy, I content myself with pointing out to attention the two leading positions in the Calvinistic system, which the language of our Articles, compared with that of our Church in her Liturgy, must, according to the position laid down, compleatly annihilate.

The fundamental position in the Calvinistic system is, that certain individuals among mankind are ordained to eternal life, others to eternal destruction, by an absolute irrespective decree of God, before the world began. But in the opening of the Liturgy, our Church assures her members, that God “desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live; and that he pardoneth all them that truly repent, and un-

feignedly believe his holy Gospel." To make, therefore, the doctrine of the Church to be in this instance *Calvinistic*, it must be admitted, that God does not desire an event to take place, which He at the same time has absolutely decreed shall take place. Again, the prayer of St. CHRYSOSTOM concludes thus: "Granting us in this world knowledge of thy truth, and in the world to come life everlasting." But, according to the *Calvinistic* system, there are but two classes of persons in the world, the *elect* and the *reprobate*; and the condition of every individual of each class, has been absolutely and irreversibly determined. This prayer, consequently, in a *Calvinistic* point of view, is totally useless. The *elect* have no occasion to make use of it; and the *reprobate* have nothing to hope from it. The *former* cannot but be saved, and the *latter* cannot but be lost.

According to CALVIN'S doctrine, JESUS CHRIST was the Redeemer only of a few chosen individuals, which had been before marked out in the Divine counsels. Whereas the answer which our Church teaches every one of her young members to make, in the second branch of the summary of his belief, is this: "Secondly, in God the Son, who has redeemed me and all mankind." In strict correspondence with which idea, in the other sacrament of our Church, JESUS CHRIST is declared by our Church to have made "a full, perfect, and sufficient

sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the *whole world*." To which shall be added only, the following extract from one of the prayers appointed for Ash-Wednesday: "O most mighty God and merciful Father, who hast compassion upon *all men*, and hatest *nothing* that Thou hast made; and who *wouldest not* the death of a sinner, but that he should turn from his sin and be saved, &c." Should my reader wish to see this comparison pursued through other parts of our Liturgy, he will have full satisfaction on the subject by an appeal to the publication above referred to; from the perusal of which he will certainly conclude, should he not be already prepared so to do, that, considering, as Mr. O. does, our Articles to be *Calvinistic*, it was much more advisable to *talk* of ascertaining the real sense of the Articles by the mutual illustration which our different forms afford each other, than *actually to attempt it*.

Mr. O. having, as it appears, escaped from this first ground of enquiry, by making *naked assertion* supply the place of demonstrative proof, proceeds to establish his point by an appeal to the title which the Articles bear; which certainly is calculated to remove all doubt, relative to the sense in which it was intended that the Articles should be subscribed; it being declared in the title prefixed to them, that they were framed for avoiding diversities of opinions, and the establishing of consent touching true



religion. "To establish this standard of subscription, according to the literal and grammatical sense, was the object of the Royal Declaration, which now stands prefixed to the Articles in our Prayer-book; which, as Mr. O. observes, like preambles in general, was made for the express purpose of teaching us the right method of interpretation, which was to be this: 'that no man shall either print or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it, in the plain and full meaning thereof; and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.' If, therefore, (proceeds Mr. O.) common language be any longer to be made the vehicle of common sense, whatever is the plain, literal, grammatical, and full sense of the words of the Articles, that is the sense in which they are to be understood." P. 47.

As both Mr. O. and myself equally admit the validity of the standard here set up, for the purpose of ascertaining and determining the sense in which our Articles are to be subscribed; and as, it is presumed, we are equally capable of ascertaining the plain, literal, grammatical sense of a given proposition; it may, perhaps, appear extraordinary, that in our application of this standard to our respective interpretation of the Articles in question, we should totally differ.

Mr. O. considers the plain, literal, grammatical sense of our Articles calculated to secure the *Galvinistic* interpretation of them. My position is, that the plain, literal, grammatical sense was enjoined in the declaration here referred to, for the purpose of excluding (at least indirectly) *that very interpretation*. Which of these two opinions stands on the best foundation, the reader will judge; but for that purpose he must enter somewhat critically into the subject, and attend to the particular circumstances which gave rise to the establishment of the declaration in question.

The sum of Mr. O.'s argument on the subject, if I understand him right, amounts to this:—"Whoever impartially considers the real occasion and circumstances of this declaration, and suffers it to explain its own design, will surely find, that it ties divines to this strict adherence to the Articles, from a conviction, that, thus explained, (namely, according to their literal and grammatical sense) they contained the true doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's word, and in order to terminate the unhappy differences consequent upon a departure from this rule of interpretation." P. 48. Mr. O. then proceeds to give a short history of this injunction; in which he briefly informs his reader, that Bishop LAUD, and his associates, who had adopted, (according to Mr. OVERTON's account of their creed) milder notions on *the points peculiar to*

*Calvinism*, than those which, according to the united testimony of all parties, generally prevailed in the nation at that period, were, on that account, accused (by the decided Calvinists) for departing from the *true* sense of the Articles. And that the answer made to this accusation by LAUD and his associates, for the purpose of securing themselves against the charge of prevarication on the subject, was this: that they took the Articles in their literal and grammatical sense, to support which sense the Declaration in question was set forth. P. 48. Such, then, is the substance of Mr. O.'s statement of this subject, and his mode of arguing upon it.

Taking Mr. O., then, on his own ground, the strict adherence to the Articles in their literal and grammatical sense was enjoined from a conviction, that in such sense they contained the doctrine of the Church of England. That doctrine at the time referred to, as Mr. O. informs his readers, according to the united testimony of all parties, "comprehended *the points peculiar to Calvinism*." Consequently the declaration in question was enjoined for the purpose of securing this high Calvinistic doctrine, as the true doctrine of the Church of England. Bishop LAUD then, in bringing forward this declaration, was taking the most effectual method to secure the point which the Calvinists must wish to have secured; by enjoining the Clergy to subscribe to the Articles in that sense, in which "they

contained the true doctrine of the Church of England."

But, on the score of bringing forward this declaration, which, according to Mr. O.'s statement, was calculated to secure that very interpretation which the Calvinists then considered to be the doctrine of the Church of England, Bishop LAUD was accused by the Calvinists of departing from the true sense of the Articles. From which premises the conclusion appears to be as evident as that two and two make four; that at the time this declaration was set forth, the Calvinists themselves did not consider the plain, literal, grammatical sense of the Articles compatible with the interpretation they annexed to them; for had this been the case, Bishop LAUD, who was known to be the chief spring in this business, instead of becoming the object of their accusation on this occasion, would have been entitled to their highest regard, for having thus contributed so essentially to the confirmation of the Calvinistic cause.

Upon the whole, then, the evidence Mr. O. here attempts to deduce from the Declaration under consideration, if intended to support the *Calvinistic* interpretation of our Articles, appears to be the most inadequate that could have been pitched on for this purpose; the Declaration in question (as from the language in which it is drawn up, and the circumstances which gave rise to it, will evidently appear) having been enjoined, certainly not so much to

favour that sense of our Articles, for which Mr. O. contends, as *to guard against it*.

But, that my reader may be qualified to form his own judgment on this important point, it will be necessary to enter more at large into the history of this declaration, than Mr. O. has thought proper to do.

LAUD, from his first appearance in any public character in his profession, had distinguished himself as a decided *Anti-Calvinist*. When President of St. John's college, he brought on himself the charge of Popery from the then Vice-Chancellor, for declaring himself against *Calvinism*; a charge to which the Puritan party always had recourse, as calculated to place the opposers of their Calvinistic principles in the most obnoxious point of view. *Puritanism* and *Calvinism* had long been travelling on hand in hand, together, till, at the death of KING JAMES, they were nearly arrived at that zenith of power, which terminated in the compleat destruction of the established Constitution of this country. LAUD saw the danger that was approaching, and used every means that his judgment suggested to stop or divert its course. Such was the object he had in view, in bringing forward the Declaration in question, which was designed chiefly, says Dr. WATERLAND, to bridle the Calvinists, by laying a restraint on that controversial style of preaching, in which the Calvinistic Ministers particularly indulged; which, whilst

it spread and kept alive dissensions on religious subjects, was also industriously employed to minister fuel to that lurking fire of faction, which was at this time on the point of breaking forth into a flame. The immediate cause which gave rise to this Declaration, must be traced back to the publication of a book by *Mountague*, afterwards bishop of Chichester, intitled "*An Answer to the Gagger*;" in which many Articles peculiar to Puritanism were set aside; and among others the *five Predestinarian Articles*, as settled at Dort, were formally disclaimed, as not constituting any part of the doctrines of the Church of England. This book, as it might be supposed, gave great offence to the Calvinistic party, and caused an information against its author to be laid before Parliament. MOUNTAGUE appealed to the KING, who approved the book in question, and thought his distinguishing the doctrines of CALVIN from those of the Church of England sufficiently defensible. MOUNTAGUE's "*Appeal to Cæsar*," as it was entitled, the King ordered to be published. It was accordingly licensed by Dr. WHITE, dean of Carlisle, with this approbation prefixed: "That there was nothing contained in the same, but what was agreeable to the public faith, doctrine, and discipline, established in the Church of England." The rejection, therefore, of the *Calvinistic tenets*, as not constituting any part of the established doctrine of the Church of England, was thus publicly confirmed. King JAMES, how-

ever, dying before this appeal was quite printed off, it was addressed to King CHARLES.

The first Parliament that met in the reign of CHARLES, manifesting an intention of proceeding against MOUNTAGUE, by committing him to the custody of the Serjeant, and obliging him to give security for his appearance; to divert the impending prosecution, LAUD, and some other bishops, wrote in his behalf to the Duke of BUCKINGHAM, remonstrating against the bold and unwarrantable step about to be taken by the Commons. In their letter they observe, that “all the opinions contained in MOUNTAGUE’s book, had been seen and approved by the late King, which certainly they would not have been, had they crossed with truth and the Church of England.” The bishops then proceed thus; “We must be bold to say, that we cannot conceive what use there can be of civil government in the commonwealth, or of preaching, and external ministry in the Church, if such fatal opinions (alluding to the predestinarian tenets) as some, which are opposite and contrary to those delivered by Mr. M. shall be publicly taught and maintained. We are certain,” continue the bishops, “that all or most of the *contrary* opinions were treated of at Lambeth, and ready to be published: but then Queen ELIZABETH, of famous memory, upon notice given how little they agreed with the practice of piety and obedience to all government, caused them to be

suppressed; and so they have continued ever since, till of late some of them have received countenance at the Synod of Dort."

This letter so far produced effect, that this Parliament proceeded no further against MOUNTAGUE. The second Parliament, which met under CHARLES, returned to the consideration of MOUNTAGUE'S book; which, being referred to a committee, Mr. PYM, one of the leaders of the Puritan faction, made his report upon it, which concluded with a prayer for the impeachment of its author. But, though the impeachment did not proceed, nor was any notice taken of the matter in Convocation, the circumstance, however, led to conferences between the divines of different persuasions, for the purpose of coming to some accommodation upon the points in dispute. And as these conferences produced no good effect, the King, by the advice of his bishops, to prevent the controversy growing warmer, published a proclamation to forbid its continuance; enjoining the Clergy, "that, neither by writing, preaching, printing, conferences, or otherwise, they raise doubts, or publish any singularities, concerning religion: but that, upon arguments of this nature, they keep themselves close to the doctrine and discipline established." This proclamation had the same object in view with the *Declaration* set forth; namely, to prevent all curious controversial disquisitions beyond the plain letter of the Articles. In the



next Parliament, which met in March 1628, the Commons commenced their proceedings in their usual way, with complaints on the subject of religion; which the Puritans were constantly bringing forward, for the purpose of supporting their party against what they called the *Arminian faction*; which, for the purpose of raising that prejudice against it in the public mind, which might tend to promote the particular object the Puritan party then had in view, they constantly represented as inclining towards and designing to bring in Popery. In the latter end of this year, therefore, as the best expedient for laying the predestinarian disputes at rest, by silencing the controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians, LAUD procured the reprinting the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, with the *Declaration* alluded to, prefixed. \*

Now, as every law furnishes the best comment on its own meaning and design, by adverting to the cause or causes which gave rise to its institution, so will it be found to be the case with this Declaration; which, by alluding to the differences which had taken place between divines, on those subjects of controversy which had been long in agitation, points out clearly the object it had in view; which was, to prevent all further curious search into those prede-

\* These particulars have been detailed for the purpose of pointing out the close connection subsisting between Puritanism and Calvinism, at the period under consideration.

tinarian points, (in which the *essence* of Calvinism consists) and “that all disputes should be shut up in God’s promises, as they be generally set forth unto us in Holy Scripture, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them.” In this light was the above Declaration seen at the time, as designed to stop the progress of those disputes which disturbed the peace of the Church, by confining the Clergy to the *literal* sense of the Articles; and thereby preventing them (to make use of the law phrase) from travelling out of the record. On this account it was so loudly complained of by the Calvinists of the day, that even an address to the King was prepared by them against it. “The petition sets forth, what a restraint was laid upon them from preaching the *saving* doctrines of God’s *free grace* in *election* and *predestination*. That this had brought them under a very uncomfortable dilemma, either of falling under the Divine displeasure, if they did not execute their commission in declaring the whole counsel of God; or of being censured for opposition to his Majesty’s authority, in case they preached the received doctrines of the Church.”—*Collter*. The received doctrines of the Church then, in the judgment of the Calvinists, were the *saving* doctrines of God’s *free grace* in *election* and *predestination*, according to the Calvinistic interpretation. From preaching these doc-

arries, the Calvinists, according to the tenor of their petition, were *restrained* by the Royal Declaration.

But the Declaration only enjoined the *Clergy* "to shut up all disputes in God's promises, as they be generally set forth in Holy Scripture, and the *general* meaning of the Articles of the Church of England, and not to print or preach, to draw the Article (by which, from the context, the 17th Article seems clearly to be meant) aside any way, nor put his own sense or comment to the meaning of the Article, but to take it in the literal and grammatical sense." Therefore the *literal* and *grammatical* sense of the Article alluded to, in connection with the *general* meaning of the Articles of the Church of England, did not, in the opinion of the Calvinists of that period, contain the saving doctrines of God's *free grace in election and predestination*, according to the Calvinistic interpretation.

Having thus brought the history of this Declaration before my reader, he will be qualified to judge what degree of service it ministers to the cause Mr. Q. has brought it to support.

But, before I quit this subject, it will be proper to say a few words to the ingenious conclusion Mr. Q. has drawn from his premises on this occasion. I call it *ingenious*, because to me it appears to require some degree of ingenuity to convert a divine, who had been distinguished through his whole life in the

facter of a decided *Anti-Calvinist*, whom some would call *that highflying Arminian, LAUD*, into a *Calvinist*. "In this view, therefore," says Mr. O., "alluding to the literal and grammatical sense of the Articles, to support which the Declaration was set forth, and, as it is expressive of the doctrines then taught in the Church, it proves our side to be *a fortiori*; inasmuch as, of the two parties, which the Church was divided, that which was the most moderate professed to reach this standard; while the other, which consisted of a great majority, supposed to exceed it." P. 48. Either Mr. O. himself was ignorant of the real state of our Church at the period here referred to, when he wrote the foregoing sentence, or he wrote it on the presumption that his reader might have no knowledge on the subject, but what was to be derived from his assertions. According to Mr. O.'s account, the Church of England was at this time divided into two parties, consisting of mild and rigid Calvinists. The former of which LAUD and his associates at their head, who had adopted, Mr. O. says, "milder notions on the points peculiar to Calvinism:"—whilst the latter, which constituted by far a "great majority," were distinguished by the more rigid notions. The Declaration in question, therefore, having been brought forward by LAUD and his associates, was of course brought forward for the purpose of securing those milder notions on the peculiar tenets of Calvinism,

which they are here said to profess. On this ground Mr. O. has built his *a fortiori* argument, (as he calls it) to prove that the Declaration in question must support that species of mild Calvinism which he maintains; because, to this standard the *most moderate Calvinists*, (namely, LAUD, and his associates) professed to reach. But this surely is pressing LAUD into the service of Calvinism with a vengeance. It is making him a Calvinist, for the purpose of making the Declaration which originated with him, minister to a Calvinistic purpose. It is a bad cause, in the defence of which nothing can be said: what, then, must that cause be, in the defence of which, whatever is said, proves to be worse than nothing?

My reader, when he has properly examined the ground on which Mr. O. builds on this occasion, will find, if I mistake not, that the *a fortiori argument*, which he appears to bring forward with some degree of confidence, will, so far as proof is concerned in it, dwindle into something worse than no argument at all. For if LAUD, instead of being a *mild Calvinist*, as Mr. O. describes him, was in no degree a Calvinist, but, on the contrary, a most declared *Anti-Calvinist*, as was most certainly the case, and as the reader has seen from the history of the Declaration just laid before him; the Declaration brought forward by him, instead of being intended to establish a standard for Calvinism, was designed to set up a barrier, beyond which it might not be able

to pass in any shape; and on that account must be considered, in the intention of its framer, to be most decidedly *Anti-Calvinistic*. Whilst, therefore, I admit with Mr. O., that this instrument was intended to secure the literal and grammatical construction of our Articles; I must at the same time maintain, on the ground of what appears to be most incontrovertible evidence, that this construction, so far from being in any degree favourable to the interpretation which Mr. O. is here attempting to draw from it, was a construction, which even Calvinists themselves, at the time, considered to be totally incompatible with it.

If, then, there be any force in the argument brought forward by Mr. O. on this occasion, instead of its being decisive for him, it is most certainly decisive against him. For admitting that the intention of this Declaration, in conformity with Mr. O.'s premises, is to be determined by the particular opinions of the parties through whose influence it was brought forward, and who may be considered as the constructors of it; it follows, that not *Calvinism*, but *Arminianism*, as the true doctrine of the Church at that time, was designed to be established by it: Since nothing is more certain, than that LAUD and his associates were most decided *Arminians*. "LAUD," says the historian MOSHEIM, "rejected the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination publicly in the year 1625, and notwithstanding the opposition and

remonstrances of ABBOT, (who leaned to the contrary persuasion) substituted the Arminian system in its place."

In fact, Mr. O. appears not to have understood, or at least to have overlooked, the real design of the Declaration in question; which was not in fact to establish a standard either for *Calvinism* or *Arminianism* but to make peace between the contending parties, by enjoining that sense of the Articles which was calculated to silence the predestinarian controversy on both sides. If, therefore, Mr. O. considers the design of this Declaration to be different from what it really was, by representing it as intended to establish a standard, by which the opinions of the two parties, into which the Church was at this time divided, were to be tried and confirmed; he certainly sets up a standard against himself. For it is most certain, that if the establishment of any such standard had been the object in view, LAUD, who was the principal constructor of it, would have taken care that it should have been so framed as to establish his own system, the *Arminian*,—not the *Calvinistic*, which he had formally and publicly rejected.

So much for Mr. OVERTON's conversion of the decided Anti-Calvinist LAUD into a *mild Calvinist*; for the purpose of making the Declaration, penned by him with the express design of *shutting up the Calvinistic disputes in God's general promises*, subservient to a Calvinistic purpose.

The next method proposed by Mr. O., by which the precise doctrines intended to be established in the written confessions of our Church are to be ascertained, is the examination of the other writings and declarations of her Reformers on the same subjects. "These writings," Mr. O. observes, "are at once commentaries upon the established creed, and in themselves *direct* evidences what doctrines were uniformly taught by the framers and imposers of it." P. 55.

Desirous of differing from Mr. O. no further than a strict regard to truth obliges me to do, I still find it necessary to object to the above method of proof, as here *generally* laid down. If by the other writings of our Reformers is to be understood our Liturgy, this certainly does furnish the most direct evidence what precise doctrines were intended to be established; and a comparison of our Articles with our Liturgy brings the present subject into the smallest compass, by proving to demonstration the peculiar tenets of Calvinism and the precise doctrines of our Church to be incompatible. So far as these writings, therefore, are concerned, the advantage of the above method of proof on this occasion will be readily admitted. Because these writings constitute that general standard, by which the established doctrines were meant to be determined; and, like two counterparts, were designed mutually to correspond. But if by the writings of our Re-



formers are meant their other more *private* writings, it appears to me, that such writings can at most afford but presumptive evidence on the subject under consideration. *Direct* evidence in this case can be derived only from the correct and literal construction of the proposition in which the doctrine designed to be established is contained; for every law is to be understood in the exact terms in which it is drawn up; and is, or should be, written in such clear, simple, and precise terms, as admit of no latitude of interpretation. To determine the meaning of a law by any other standard than that set up by the letter of it, is to deviate from the known and safe practice of interpretation, and to open a door to endless litigation.

The Articles, then, considered as a species of laws, being certain propositions established for the government of religious opinions, must be received in their letter; and we are not justified in going beyond their letter for a meaning, except in parts, should any such there be, where the words made use of are judged incapable of conveying a determinate sense. And even in such cases, the private writings of our Reformers will be of service only to determine what the meaning of any given proposition is not, rather than what it decidedly is. For besides the uncertainty which must ever belong to a conclusion drawn from passages of writings detached from their proper context, and unconnected with the

particular circumstances to which those passages immediately refer; there are particular points in our established forms, on which our Reformers themselves might entertain some difference of opinion. The question, therefore, is not what were the sentiments of our Reformers *individually*, but what was their judgment *collectively*; on which, as a proper basis, they thought it expedient to erect the public standard of national faith. From whence it follows, that the private writings of divines concerned in the Reformation, as *individuals*, though they may furnish presumptive proof of what doctrines were generally meant to be established in our Articles, yet certainly do not furnish that *direct* proof necessary to ascertain their precise meaning. This, as has been already observed, must be sought for in the words of the Article in question, which must speak for itself; whilst every meaning, not warranted by the plain and literal construction of the language in which the Article is drawn up, is to be considered to be that super-induced meaning, to which the subscriber is not bound, further than he may find it to be consistent with the general doctrine of the Church. Otherwise we, in a manner, invert the order of proof in this case; instead of making the public standard the test of private opinion we are in fact appealing to private opinion, for the purpose of determining the meaning of the public standard. “Against this principle of interpretation,

taken from the known opinion of the compilers, (says the Bishop of BANGOR, in his excellent discourse on this subject) I have already excepted; because it was not the object proposed in framing those Articles, to express the full sentiments of them, or perhaps of any part of the Convocation to whom they were submitted for approbation; but to give that moderated statement of every point in discussion, which might meet the consent of all. To suppose, therefore, any doctrine, not clearly expressed in words to be therein intended, is to set aside the first and general principle upon which they acted."—To apply the foregoing reasoning to the construction of the seventeenth Article, which, because the words *predestination* and *election* are to be found in it, is generally considered by Calvinists to be decisive of the doctrine they maintain.

It is possible, and to me it appears most probable, that if our Reformers, when engaged in the construction of this Article, had been called upon for their respective definition of what they understood by *predestination*, their definitions would not have strictly corresponded. They seem to have considered this subject as not sufficiently revealed in the scriptures, to authorize them to determine on any public and decisive interpretation of it. Each Reformer, on this occasion, seems to have contented himself with the possession of his own private judgment, in which they would differ from each other in propor-

tion to the greater or less degree of extent, to which their contemplations had carried this subject; whilst, in the standard which they were constructing for public profession, they adopted, in the construction of this particular Article, a plan calculated to leave the subscribers to it in possession of the same private judgment which they assumed to themselves. This they effected, by suffering scripture to speak *solely* for itself on this mysterious subject, by a reference to those texts which were considered as bearing upon it; but at the same time without annexing to those texts any particular comment to ascertain their precise meaning; thereby leaving the subject of predestination to stand on the same ground on which it stood in scripture, by saying no more upon it than the plain words of scripture warranted. That such was the idea that prevailed in the minds of our original Reformers, may be collected from the answer given by RIDLEY to BRADFORD, who seemed to have wished, that the established language of our public confession had been more decisive on this particular subject. “Where you say, (says the Bishop, in answer to a letter received from BRADFORD, complaining of some heresies that had been broached) that if the request had been heard, things (you think) had been in better case than they be; know you, that concerning the matter you mean, I have in Latin drawn out the places of the scriptures, and upon the same have noted what

I can for the time. Sir, in those matters, I am so fearful, *that I dare not speak further*, yea almost none otherwise than the very text doth (as it were) lead me by the hand." COVERDALE, in the margin of this Letter, published by him in 1564, notes thus: "He meaneth the matter of GOD's election."

BRADFORD had written a Treatise on the subject of GOD's election, which he had sent for the revisal of our principal Reformers, CRANMER, RIDLEY, and LATIMER, when in prison at Oxford. This Treatise, as appears from RIDLEY's Letter on the occasion, was not approved; it being considered as carrying the point further, by speaking more decidedly upon it, than the Reformers thought him warranted by the plain letter of scripture; by strict conformity to which they appear to have been guided in their construction of the 17th Article.

Although, therefore, the *private* writings of our Reformers do not furnish evidence sufficient to determine what was their precise opinion on the subject of predestination; yet, taken in connection with the article in question, they authorize us to say, what that opinion was not. In a word, it most undoubtedly was not *Calvinistic*. For the private writings of our Reformers maintain, in most unequivocal language, the doctrine of *universal* redemption; and the doctrine of predestination referred to in the Article is to be received in conformity with the promises of GOD, "as they are *generally* set forth

in holy scripture." But the *Calvinistic* doctrine of redemption is totally incompatible with the promises of God, as they are *generally* set forth in holy scripture; "it is not either read therein, nor may be proved thereby;" consequently, it was not the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, which our Reformers meant to establish as the doctrine of the Church of England.

It was with a view to this presumptive kind of evidence, to be drawn from the writings of our *original* Reformers, in proof of their Anti-Calvinistic sentiments, that extracts from them were brought before the public in my fourth Letter to Sir RICHARD HILL, which professes to treat on this particular object. Now, according to the position laid down by Mr. O. himself, in the opening of the present part of his subject, "The writings of our reformers, are at once commentaries on the established creed, and in themselves direct evidences what doctrines were uniformly taught by the framers and imposers of it." If so, the nearer we draw from the fountain, the purer we may expect the stream to be; consequently, the writings of our *first* Reformers above-mentioned must, it is presumed, furnish the most unexceptionable evidence in such a case; and for some reasons, perhaps, to be preferred before evidence drawn from the writings under ELIZABETH. Mr. O. however, has passed over unnoticed the evidence from the writings of the above *first* Reformers, brought forward in support of the immediate subject

of my fourth Letter; and because he met with a quotation from the "*necessary doctrine*" in another Letter, and applied to another subject, from this circumstance he leads his reader to conclude, that no other evidence had been resorted to on this occasion. For after mentioning what he calls "the confessedly *Popish necessary doctrine*," with reference to the Appendix to the Guide, he proceeds thus:—"To these Popish and heterogeneous works of the reign of HENRY VIII. the whole tribe of our opponents appeal, as to the authorities that are indisputable; while the writings under ELIZABETH, of the very period when our Articles assumed their present form and authority, and of the very persons who gave them this form and authority, are scarcely once glanced at." P. 57.

I shall not stop here to animadvert on the incorrectness of language in the foregoing statement, as it is not probable that it can escape the intelligent reader; because Mr. O. proceeds to point out something very material to be remarked, which is this, that the appeal to these "Popish and heterogeneous works of the reign of HENRY VIII. is chiefly made on the subject which constituted the fundamental ground of difference between the two churches, that which respects human merit, and the proper province of grace and works! This circumstance, (continues Mr. O.) discovers no little of the true nature of their cause." P. 57.

This appears designed by Mr. O. to be an indirect reflection on his supposed opponents, from which his reader is led to conclude, that by their appeal to the Popish works of HENRY VIII., as they are called by way of opprobrium, the object they had in view was the support of the Popish cause. Mr. O.'s remark on this occasion either has this meaning, or it has none. But the reader, without some assistance from Mr. O., will perhaps be at a loss to discover, how a quotation, taken from a publication principally directed against Popery, can be made for the purpose of advancing the Popish cause. "The appeal," Mr. O. observes, "is chiefly made on the very subject which constituted the fundamental ground of difference between the two Churches; that which respects *human merit*, and the proper province of faith and works." And can Mr. O. point out works to which an appeal could be so properly made on this subject, as to those which were designed to point out this difference, and to correct the error which constituted the ground of it? Such was the principle of two publications sent forth in the reign of HENRY VIII., the first entitled, "*The Institution of a Christian Man*," published in 1537; the other, which was a sort of second edition of it, under the new title of "*Pia & Catholica Institutio*," printed in 1544, being the translation of a Book printed the year before under the title of "A necessary Doctrine and



Erudition for any Christian," set forth by the King's Majesty. They were both the work of our original Reformers, with CRANMER at their head. That there were some Popish errors relative to the real presence and images to be found in these works is admitted; "but these," says STRYPE, "in reference to the first of them, were added by the King, after the Bishops had set their hands to the contrary."

But it is not consistent with sound reasoning to maintain, that because a work may contain some error, that therefore it contains no truth. That the works in question do contain sound truth; and consequently furnish good proof with respect to the judgment of our Reformers, on the subject under immediate consideration, the reader will judge for himself from the following extracts. On the article of justification, the framers of "*The Institution of a Christian Man*" maintain, "that this blessing is granted for the merits and satisfaction of our BLESSED SAVIOUR; that our pardon stands upon this ground; and that no good works on our parts could reconcile us to GOD, or procure his favour, and prevail for our justification." "The necessary doctrine under the article Faith maintains, that where we are said to be justified by faith, it must be considered in conjunction with hope and charity. And, to prevent an over-reliance on bare belief, it is added, that all GOD's promises are suspended upon conditions, and suppose our endeavours to obedience. And be-

cause a certain assurance of being of the number of the predestinate is maintained by some persons; therefore, to keep people from avoiding the extremes of presumption and despair, or resting too much on their thoughts and persuasion, the Book tells us this question is *undetermined* in scripture." Under the article *good works*, "the *necessary doctrine*," after censuring the superstitious observances of the Monks, and the reliance upon will-worship, maintains, that the "necessity and value of good works is no lessening of the grace of God. For all such commendable actions are the effects of Divine grace. Our merits, as ST. AUSTIN speaks, are but the gifts of God; therefore we have no reason to boast of our performances, or value ourselves upon the regularity of our conduct."

The above doctrine, it is presumed, is sufficiently *Anti-Popish*, to rescue these publications from the indiscriminate charge brought against them. But it is to be observed, that my reference to "the *necessary doctrine*" was not made with any view to prove the Anti-Calvinistic sentiments of our Reformers; for had that been my object, I should have appealed to another part of the said publication, which immediately bears upon that point; which speaks of predestination nearly in the same language in which it is treated in the seventeenth Article, as a *doctrine undetermined* in scripture. But my appeal to the necessary doctrine was for the purpose of bringing

the authority of our Reformers, to the support of a position, connected with the great Evangelical Article of Justification by Faith; that fundamental doctrine of grace, which all Christians, whether Calvinists or not, must be equally zealous to maintain. As, therefore, this appeal to “the *necessary doctrine*” related to a general evangelical article, not to one peculiarly Calvinistic; it could not be made for, because it was not calculated to answer, the purpose of marking the precise line of discrimination between the evangelical doctrines of the Church of England, and the peculiar tenets of J. CALVIN. From whence it follows, that it does not apply to the subject now under immediate consideration; consequently Mr. O.’s objection to it, on that presumption, falls to the ground.

It is not with a view to retaliate Mr. O.’s insinuation on this occasion, that I observe, that a suspicion of an inclination to Popery might attach to the favourers of Calvinism with more shew of reason than Mr. O. has attempted to make it attach to its opponents, from the circumstance of my appeal to “the *necessary doctrine*.” For the Dean of GLOUCESTER, in his Letter to Dr. KIPPIS on this subject, has laid it down as a most solemn truth, “that at the time just preceding the Réformation, the Church of Rome, in respect to predestination, grace, free-will, and perseverance, was truly *Calvinistical*.” And the Rev. DAVID SIMPSON, of Mac-

clesfield, gives an account, in one of his publications, of “an honest Calvinistical minister, who *experienced* a call to convert the Pope: the consequence was, as might be expected, according to SANCHO’s observation, ‘that going for wool he came back shorn;’ for himself became a convert to Popery. He then *experienced* another call, to remove the errors of his Calvinistic brethren in New-England. He went there accordingly, and told them what comfort he found from invoking the Saints, and what happiness he felt from experiencing the favour and assistance of the Blessed Virgin in answer to his prayers: He assured them, that her interest with her son, was strongly exerted in behalf of all who applied to her; for that JESUS continued to be as dutiful and obedient to his mother in Heaven, as he had been upon earth. That he had not the least doubt, were they but once to enjoy the sweet consolations of penance, the unspeakable satisfaction of auricular confession, as he constantly did, the heartfelt confidence and calm composure of extreme unction, they would, like him, return to the true fold, and give God thanks for his abundant grace.”

To Mr. O.’s method of proving the doctrines contained in our confessions from the writings of individuals, I have little to say; because such a method of proof, could it be fairly carried into effect, militates against that mode of interpretation, by which

alone the sense of our Articles is to be determined; namely, the literal and grammatical construction of the language in which they are drawn up. But besides the impracticability of it, the manner in which it has been generally attempted, is open to great objection; for "the references made for this purpose (as the Bishop of BANGOR has observed) have been most often made, not to the compilers *collectively* taken, but *partially* to individuals; and not so much to the general language of their writings, as to such of their known tenets as have best coincided with the sentiments of those who make the reference."

To attempt to ascertain the doctrines of our Church by the productions of different writers in ELIZABETH's time, appears to be setting the subscriber to our Articles upon a sort of wild-goose chase; making him go a great way about, in search of what he might find with more certainty and less trouble at home; by simply placing the Articles and Liturgy before him, and suffering the plain sense of an honest and unprejudiced mind to determine his judgment upon them. Many of Queen ELIZABETH's Divines were strongly tinctured with Calvinism. Viewing the doctrines of our Church through a Calvinistic medium, it was natural for them to annex to them a Calvinistic interpretation. But how far this interpretation is warranted, must be determined not by the opinion of individuals, but by the letter of the Articles themselves.

Mr. O. mentions the analysis of the Articles by the Rev. T. ROGERS, as one of the publications in the reign of ELIZABETH calculated to ascertain the doctrine of our Church. This analysis, we are told, was dedicated first to Archbishop WHITGIFT, and probably because it was Calvinistic: the Archbishop himself being supposed to be, in some degree at least, tainted with Calvinism. "The doctrines (Mr. O. takes occasion to observe) which, in *Mr. ROGERS's judgment*, the words of the Articles naturally import, and which, he says, were all approved for true and Christian, by the lawful and public allowance of the Church at that time, are clearly Calvinistic." P. 64. But what does this testimony prove more, than that such was the opinion of Mr. ROGERS? and that such was, admitting Mr. ROGERS's statement to be correct, the prevailing sense of the Church of England in the year 1584, when this analysis of the Articles was first published? Such we know to be the opinion of Mr. O., as well as of another writer, who has lately appeared under the title of *Presbyter*; who tells the world, in the language of decided confidence, "that the opinions of those divines by whom our Articles were compiled, were uniformly, clearly, and definitively Calvinistic;" that "the Articles are only capable of a Calvinistic sense;" and "that the liturgical services of our Church were formed in correspondence with her Articles of

Religion.”\* According to this statement, there should be no divines in the Church of England, but such as are *decided Calvinists*. The fact however is, and we justify it by the Declaration prefixed to our Articles, that from the time when that instrument was set forth down to the present day, a space of near two hundred years, the great body of the established Clergy have been decidedly Anti-Calvinistic in the strict sense of that term.

To what, then, does Mr. O.’s evidence amount? Mr. ROGERS considered our Articles to be *Calvinistic*. So does Mr. O; so does *Presbyter*: and Mr. O. might bring forward many others of the same sentiments. In opposition to whom, fifty writers, of the first authority and character in the history of this country, might be as readily produced. But this is only weighing opinions against opinions; and the parties concerned will never be agreed in this case, who shall turn the scale. This, therefore, is not the method by which the point can ever be determined. To the law, then, and to the testimony. Let the Articles and Liturgy speak their own plain language, and the matter must be brought to a speedy issue. In such case Mr. O., with ten thousand writers in his train, must not be expected to prevail against demonstrative evidence. For if by *Calvinistic* doctrines Mr. O. and myself mean the same

\* “ The Church of England vindicated, &c. by a Presbyter of the Church of England.” Octavo, 1801.

thing, which we must, if Mr. O. annexes a precise idea to that term; it is most certain, that the doctrines of the Church of England cannot, in the strict sense of the word, be *Calvinistic*. For as it is impossible in nature, that *white* should be *black*, and *black white*; so is it equally impossible in reason, that *partial* redemption in the *Calvinistic* sense, and *universal* redemption in the sense of our Liturgy, should be the established doctrine of the same Church.

Upon this principle of interpretation, according to which our Articles and Liturgy are considered as competent to explain their own meaning; (for the law of common sense obliges us to make the Articles and Liturgy consistent, and to believe that both, being established by the same authority, must in reality mean the same thing;) I did say in the "Guide," what I still feel myself authorised in saying, that "I do not take my faith from the writings of LUTHER, CALVIN, or St. AUGUSTIN; but from the Articles and Liturgy of the Church of England, as consonant with the word of GOD in holy scripture. Should Mr. O. think me too confident, I can take shelter under authority that he will respect. "If some divines (says Bishop HALL) shall defend the rigid opinions of predestination, (which he somewhere distinguishes by the title of the *Belgic disease*, in allusion to the synod of Dort) surely the Church is a collective body, so it hath



a tongue of her own, speaking by the common voice of her synods, of her public Confessions, Articles, Constitutions, Catechism, Liturgies: what she says in them must pass for her own; but if any single person shall take upon himself, unauthorized, to be the mouth of the Church, his insolence is justly censurable." Vol. iii, p. 45. To which authority I shall add the answer which FELTHAM gave to the Jesuit, who charged the Protestants with making God the author of sin, by predestinating men to eternal punishment, by his sole will without any fault: "For predestination," says FELTHAM, "you urge *Calvin*. But, Sir, the Church of England is not bound to his tenets; nor do I hold my faith from him, but from my blessed SAVIOUR, and his Apostles. Let it suffice, I hold man fallen to be the subject of predestination. I believe no man saved, but by God's mercy; no man damned, but by his own default." FELTHAM's Resolves, fol. p. 77.

What Mr. O. has quoted, p. 67, from the Anti-Jacobin, as introductory to this extract from "the Guide," I wish had been omitted. Though the editors of the Anti-Jacobin certainly meant to pay me a compliment, to which it would be my pride to be fully entitled; still Mr. O., in his application of their language, certainly meant to pay me none. Such language from him can, therefore, be considered in no other light than as the language of *irony*. But as *irony* is not argument, and is moreover a figure

in which I do not deal; I leave Mr. O. in full possession of all the advantage to be derived from it, and pass on.

Mr. O. thus proceeds:—"We would, however, ask this Gentleman by the way, how he can attempt to persuade his reader, 'that by an appeal to historic fact' he has brought him 'acquainted with the circumstances which accompanied the original establishment of our present Church doctrine,' and 'qualified him to form a decided opinion on the subject;' when the 'historic facts' consist of quotations from *books full of Popery*, written many years before the regular Reformation of our Church commenced; quotations, which affirm that 'good works be the very service of God, and be *meritorious* towards the attaining of everlasting life;' of a few detached passages that are perfectly *equivocal*, and of other mere second-hand scraps, taken from avowed *partizans* in the business; and when scarcely one of *those great works* we have mentioned, which, beyond all question, were so intimately connected with the 'original establishment of our present Church doctrine,' is even affirmed to exist! How is this reconcileable with common integrity?" P. 68. As the above charge, from the strong manner in which it is drawn up, is calculated to make some impression; I have brought it before my reader, for the purpose of his being convinced that the writer to whom it refers, is not afraid to meet it.

Mr. O. here asks a question, though not a very delicate one; and if, instead of suffering an hasty judgment to dictate an hasty sentence, he had waited for my answer, I am disposed to think, he would have withheld that reflection which he has at least obliquely cast upon my *moral* character, by leading his reader to conclude, that the manner in which I handled the subject under consideration, is not reconcilable with "*common integrity*."

As Mr. O., therefore, has not waited for my answer, I must be content with giving it to my reader. From Mr. O.'s account, as above stated, it must be concluded, that I had adopted a very imperfect and suspicious method of qualifying my reader to form a decided judgment on the supposed Calvinism of our Establishment, by making my historic facts consist of quotations from "*books full of Popery*;" and that I had taken no notice of any other writings connected with the original establishment of our present Church doctrine. Every writer has the privilege of handling his subject in his own way. Mr. O. has adopted his method; I have adopted mine; and such, I am inclined to think, as would have proved perfectly convincing to Mr. O., had not his mind been predisposed. The reader will determine his preference in this case by his own judgment.

The object before me, in my fourth Letter to Sir RICHARD HILL on the subject of Calvinism, was

to draw up, in the shortest compass, that collection of evidence, from which the intelligent reader might be qualified to form a decided conclusion on this particular point. With this object, I judged it expedient to confine myself to that period of our Reformation, which passed before the reign of ELIZABETH; and to evidence drawn from the writings of those Reformers, who *originally* compiled our Articles and Liturgy; considering an appeal to these writings calculated to furnish the most *unequivocal* proof with regard to the sentiments of their authors. For, though the Articles were re-established under ELIZABETH, in the year 1562, yet as they were, with very immaterial alterations relative to the subject before us, the same Articles that had been before established in 1552, the materials for which had been provided and put together by our *original* Reformers in the reign of EDWARD VI.; their writings consequently must furnish the most satisfactory evidence, what doctrine was *originally* meant to be taught by them. After having, then, furnished my reader with the date when the Articles were *originally* set forth, as digested and put into form by CRANMER, RIDLEY, LATIMER, HOOPER, &c. I proceed to bring forward presumptive evidence from the writings of each of these Reformers individually, in proof of the point I had to establish.

My first evidence is taken from a book, the composition of which, is given chiefly to CRANMER,

called, the "*Erudition of a Christian Man.*" This, my reader will observe, is the only "*book full of Popery,*" as Mr. O. thinks fit to call it, to which any appeal was made on this subject; and this appeal was made for the purpose of affirming, what the reader, upon examination, will find to be true—that the doctrines of grace and free-will are explained in it in a sense totally incompatible with the Calvinistic tenets, and the doctrine of *universal redemption* unequivocally maintained. For the quotation which Mr. O. has brought forward in this same page, relative to *good works*, considered as in some sense *meritorious*, (language not meant to encroach on the exclusive merit of our SAVIOUR) though taken from the same book, is not brought forward as evidence on this occasion, but is only alluded to in another place, and applied to a very different subject, (see Appendix, p. 329;) and, therefore, ought not to have constituted a part of Mr. O.'s brief in this case.

Now admitting that this book does contain some *Popish* errors, these errors we have already observed, on the authority of the historian, "were added by the king after the bishops had set their hands to the contrary." The book, moreover, was not appealed to in confirmation of any *Popish* errors, but in confirmation of those doctrines in which the authors notoriously persevered to their death.

But before Mr. O. had stigmatized this book as being "*full of Popery,*" he should have considered

what the historian STRYPE has said upon it. The character given of this historian in the 53d page of Mr. O.'s publication, where it is said of him, "that no man has investigated these matters with more diligence, and few have obtained greater credit for integrity," ought to have given such weight to his testimony, as should have prevented Mr. O. from making use of unqualified language. Speaking of the book in question, STRYPE writes thus: "The pious Archbishop (CRANMER) thought *it* highly conducive to the Christian growth of the common people in knowledge and religion; and to disentangle them from gross ignorance and superstition, in which they had been nursed up by their *Popish Guides*," &c. This book, then, described by Mr. O. as *full of Popery*, was, according to STRYPE's account of it, professedly written against Popery; and though it was signed by BONNER and GARDINER, two Popish bishops, yet the historian proceeds to account for this circumstance in the following manner:—"In the disputations which happened among them on this work, *Winchester*, the POPE's chief champion, with three or four other of the bishops, went about with all subtle sophistry to maintain all idolatry, heresy, and superstition, &c. But, at the last, whether overpowered with number, or convinced by the word of God, and consent of ancient authors, and the primitive Church, they all agreed upon and set their hands to this godly book of religion."

This book, therefore, it is presumed, will be admitted by the reader to be of competent authority, so far at least as the appeal made to it on this occasion extends; and so far only was its authority made use of. The attempt made by Mr. O. to set aside the evidence from this book *in toto*, on the consideration of its containing some Popish errors, corresponds with that heretofore made in a Letter addressed to Dr. NOWELL, under the signature of *Clerus*, which, from its having been since reprinted in the works of Mr. TOPLADY, claims, it is presumed, him for its author. Of Mr. TOPLADY's attempt on this occasion I cannot speak from knowledge; but, if a judgment may be formed of Mr. TOPLADY's powers of reasoning, from the manner in which he set aside LATIMER's position, "that our SAVIOUR shed as much blood for JUDAS as for any other of the Apostles," by maintaining the inadmissibility of it on the following ground; that it was impossible our SAVIOUR could shed any blood for JUDAS, because "JUDAS had hanged himself, and gone to his own place, *before* our SAVIOUR's blood was shed;" it does not seem necessary that I should detain my reader on his subject.

But after all this parade and outcry against "the *Popish and heterogeneous works* of the reign of HENRY VIII." p. 57; against "books full of Popery," and against such "illegitimate testimony," p. 68; my reader will, perhaps, be surprized to find Mr. O.

appealing to the same sort of testimony. To this book, against which Mr. O.'s outcry has been raised, CRANMER subjoined some discourses, containing a kind of summary of its principal doctrines. They had for their title, "Three Discourses of Archbishop CRANMER, occasioned upon his Review of the KING's book, intitled the 'Erudition of a Christian Man.'" Now as these discourses soon followed the publication of the book itself, in the composition of which CRANMER was principally engaged, they must, together with the book in question, be classed among "*those Popish and heterogeneous works of the Reign of HENRY VIII.*", which, according to Mr. O.'s sentence against them, are *illegitimate* evidence on this subject. But to these very discourses, "these Popish and heterogeneous works," as Mr. O. calls them, in p. 57, he has himself appealed for evidence in p. 179, and p. 193, of his publication. So that what is deemed to be *illegitimate* evidence, when brought forward by the author of "The Guide to the Church," becomes *legitimate*, when appealed to by Mr. OVERTON. For such Mr. O. calls it in p. 193, where, in reference to these discourses of CRANMER, he writes thus: "In perfect harmony with these sentiments is every other *legitimate* evidence of our Church. The venerable CRANMER speaks precisely, like the Homily, of 'a dead faith,' and of 'a faith which operates,' &c." When my reader, therefore, shall have remarked, as he cannot



This book, therefore, it is presumed, will be admitted by the reader to be of competent authority, so far at least as the appeal made to it on this occasion extends; and so far only was its authority made use of. The attempt made by Mr. O. to set aside the evidence from this book *in toto*, on the consideration of its containing some Popish errors, corresponds with that heretofore made in a Letter addressed to Dr. NOWELL, under the signature of *Clerus*, which, from its having been since reprinted in the works of Mr. TOPLADY, claims, it is presumed, him for its author. Of Mr. TOPLADY's attempt on this occasion I cannot speak from knowledge; but, if a judgment may be formed of Mr. TOPLADY's powers of reasoning, from the manner in which he set aside LATIMER's position, "that our SAVIOUR shed as much blood for JUDAS as for any other of the Apostles," by maintaining the inadmissibility of it on the following ground; that it was impossible our SAVIOUR could shed any blood for JUDAS, because "JUDAS had hanged himself, and gone to his own place, *before* our SAVIOUR's blood was shed;" it does not seem necessary that I should detain my reader on his subject.

But after all this parade and outcry against "the *Popish and heterogeneous works* of the reign of HENRY VIII." p. 57; against "books full of Popery," and against such "illegitimate testimony," p. 68; my reader will, perhaps, be surprized to find Mr. O.

appealing to the same sort of testimony. To this book, against which Mr. O.'s outcry has been raised, CRANMER subjoined some discourses, containing a kind of summary of its principal doctrines. They had for their title, "Three Discourses of Archbishop CRANMER, occasioned upon his Review of the KING's book, intitled the 'Erudition of a Christian Man.'" Now as these discourses soon followed the publication of the book itself, in the composition of which CRANMER was principally engaged, they must, together with the book in question, be classed among "*those Popish and heterogeneous works of the Reign of HENRY VIII.*", which, according to Mr. O.'s sentence against them, are *illegitimate* evidence on this subject. But to these very discourses, "these Popish and heterogeneous works," as Mr. O. calls them, in p. 57, he has himself appealed for evidence in p. 179, and p. 193, of his publication. So that what is deemed to be *illegitimate* evidence, when brought forward by the author of "The Guide to the Church," becomes *legitimate*, when appealed to by Mr. OVERTON. For such Mr. O. calls it in p. 193, where, in reference to these discourses of CRANMER, he writes thus: "In perfect harmony with these sentiments is every other *legitimate* evidence of our Church. The venerable CRANMER speaks precisely, like the Homily, of 'a dead faith,' and of 'a faith which operates,' &c." When my reader, therefore, shall have remarked, as he cannot

fail to do on this occasion, the convertibility of Mr. O.'s epithets, he will be at no loss to know what is to be understood by *legitimate* and *illegitimate* evidence, according to Mr. O.'s phraseology, and will appreciate accordingly.

My next evidence relative to CRANMER consisted of a reference to the publication of Dr. NOWELL, which contains two decisive proofs of this Reformer's sentiments on the subject under consideration, which, for brevity sake, I omitted to place before my reader. To this was subjoined an evidence, drawn from the known confidential communication that passed between CRANMER and MELANCTHON, previous to the composition of the English Articles, and the as well-known rejection of CALVIN's proffered assistance in the work of our Reformation. "The Archbishop," says HEYLIN, "knew the man, and, therefore, refused his offer." The known sentiments of MELANCTHON on the subject in question were then presented to the reader, in a quotation from a Letter of his, written to CRANMER three years before our Articles were finished; and in an extract from the Augsburg Confession, which was MELANCTHON's work, professedly militating against CALVIN's fundamental tenets.

My next evidence is taken from the writings of LATIMER. From him I proceed to RIDLEY and HOOPER. For an extract from the writings of the former my reader is referred, for the reason above given, to Dr. NOWELL's publication; whilst two

most decisive extracts from those of the latter are brought to conclude that species of presumptive evidence, which the writings of our *original* Reformers are calculated to furnish, toward ascertaining the sense of the Articles they compiled.

From this presumptive evidence, after having adverted to the striking circumstance of ERASMUS's Anti-Calvinistic Commentary being set up in our Churches, from which an argument is to be drawn against the peculiar tenets of CALVIN, which no Calvinist will fairly answer; I proceed to that positive and decided evidence, furnished by the internal testimony which the Articles and Liturgy mutually furnish to each other; a species of evidence which stands on the ground of this incontrovertible position, contained in the 212th page of the Appendix, in the following words—"That our Church, in the subscription to her Articles, does not require a faith from her Clergy *different* from that which they are taught to preach in the use of the established Liturgy." With this view I tried the 17th Article, both by itself and by the Liturgy; and the judgment which such a trial necessarily drew after it was, that Calvinism, in the *proper* sense of the word, is not the doctrine of the Church of England, but an unscriptural doctrine, that has been grafted upon it by injudicious, though well-meaning, divines.

From the foregoing statement I felt myself authorized to say, what I still maintain, that, by an appeal

to historic fact, I had brought my reader sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances which accompanied the original establishment of our present Church doctrines, to qualify him to form a decided judgment on the subject under consideration. Appendix, p. 262.

Such has been my method of treating this subject. But from Mr. OVERTON's account of it the reader would conclude, that the names of our *original* Reformers were not to be found in my pages; and that the only evidence produced by me was of that Popish equivocal kind, as to be entitled to little or no credit. My reader will, therefore, judge, to whom the charge of suppressing unimpeachable evidence most attaches. My object on this occasion, considering that I was not writing an History but a Letter, was, to bring forward, not all the producible evidence on the subject, but those parts or portions of it, which might be sufficient to substantiate my point. That done, my design was completed. Supposing, then, my method of proof did not correspond with that adopted by Mr. O., still a fair statement of it ought to have been laid before his reader. Mr. O., however, apparently with the view of confirming the error into which he had been leading his reader on this occasion, proceeds, with a flippancy of language not well suited either to his subject or character, to ask the following questions: Alluding to his opponents, who are said to imitate my method of treating this subject,

Mr. O. asks, "Did they never hear of this great use of St. AUSTIN?" To which I answer; should it be admitted that St. AUSTIN's opinions had weight with our *original* Reformers, what had such a circumstance to do with the evidence I was producing from their writings?

But I have to observe moreover on this head, that Mr. O. is here begging the question, relative to the great use made of St. AUSTIN by our original Reformers. In p. 66 Mr. O. informed his readers that, "next to the sacred scriptures, our Reformers especially professed to respect the primitive Church, and *the works of St. AUSTIN.*" To me there does not appear sufficient ground for this distinction in favour of St. AUSTIN's writings. The Act of Parliament, 2 and 3 of EDWARD VI., speaking of our Reformers, with immediate relation to the work they had before them, says only, that "they had an eye, in the first place, to the more pure and sincere Christian religion in the scriptures; and, in the next place, to the usages of the primitive Church." When, therefore, it is considered that St. AUSTIN adopted a new system of explanation, different in some important respects from that which had received the general sanction of his predecessors in the Church; this particular mention of his writings, as here introduced by Mr. O., is more calculated to create an undue prejudice in his reader's

mind, than to do justice to the discrimination of our Reformers.

It is true, Bishop BURNET, in the preface to his Exposition of the Articles, says, that it has been suggested, that "the Articles seemed to be so plain a transcript of St. AUSTIN's doctrine in those much-disputed points, concerning the decrees of God, and the efficacy of grace, that they were not expounded by our Divines *for that very reason*; since the far greater number of them is believed to be now of a different opinion." And this *suggestion* the expositor has no where contradicted; although he has brought no shadow of proof to establish it. To this *suggestion*, therefore, to which Mr. O's question on this occasion appears to conform, I have but to subjoin, what was so well said to is a hundred years ago by Dr. BINKS, dean of Litchfield, in his "Prefatory Discourse to the Examination of BURNET'S Exposition." "But (says the Dean) how does it appear that our divines have acted upon this principle, or have ever been of this opinion? This is what ought to be very clearly made out; or else it is laying a thing to the charge of our divines, which is not at all for their credit; and which they will have no reason to thank my Lord of SARUM for charging them with. How does it appear, that any of our divines, that either understood themselves, or the Articles, as they should do, did ever suppose these Articles (where God's de-

crees and the efficacy of grace may seem to be concerned) were a transcript of any other doctrine than that of the scriptures in general, or of St. PAUL in particular, who is very expressive on these points?"

" True it is, that some have been apt to imagine, that the compilers of our Articles were a little *Calvinistically* given; and that though they have worded things cautiously, yet one may discern something in the seventeenth Article that looks in favour of predestination, in opposition to the *Universalists*; (as the generality of our English divines are now supposed to be.) But this surmise is nothing but a *vulgar error*, grounded upon want of history and chronology; not considering the time when those Articles, which some would draw these inferences from, were penned. There is no body doubts, but that some considerable divines that had been driven abroad by means of Queen MARY's persecution, did return with a taint of the principles of those countries where they had been. And therefore had the Articles really been framed in Queen ELIZABETH's reign, (according to the date of them, as we now subscribe them) something might be said for this *suggestion*; not but that, considering that whatever they prepared was to be agreed upon in a convocation of good English divines, (the majority whereof, in all likelihood, were for *downright English divinity*) it would even then have been



needful for the Predestinarians to have been upon their guard, and not to have been too open and express in their introducing their private opinions, or in imposing them on the Church. But that which sets aside all surmises of this kind, as to what the compilers of the Articles were in their own private judgments, it is plain, that whatever alterations happened to be made in the Articles, anno 1562, those that may seem to touch upon God's decrees, and the efficacy of grace, are either the same that were agreed upon in King EDWARD's reign, anno 1552; or what is altered in them, is rather to *fence against the Predestinarian doctrine*, (according to the modern acceptance of the word) than any way designed *in favour of it*: witness the additional clause in the seventeenth Article, the better to provide against the presumption of such as might build too much upon their being *predestinated or called*:—*Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy scripture, and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.*" P. 87, 88. Mr. O. proceeds:—"Did they never hear of the writings of the Bishops and Martyrs in prison?" To which my answer is: I not only heard of them, I moreover formally appealed to the writings of four of those Martyrs for evidence; but Mr. O. has given me no credit for it. And with respect to NOWELL's Catechism, JEWELL's Apo-

logy, and other publicly-approved works referred to by Mr. O., as they belonged to that period of our Reformation under ELIZABETH, on which I professed not to enter, they did not fall within the compass of my plan. Whilst one principal reason that determined my attention to that period of our Reformation that passed during the lives of our original Reformers was, because evidence drawn from their writings would, I conceived, be deemed more unimpeachable than evidence drawn from publications of a later date.

When my reader has, therefore, read Mr. O.'s account of my manner of treating the subject under consideration, as stated by him in the 68th page of his publication; and compared it with the fourth letter in my Appendix, in which this subject is professedly handled; when he shall have remarked that the evidence brought forward in my pages is almost wholly kept out of sight by Mr. O.; the testimony in most decided contradiction to the principal of the Calvinistic tenets, represented by him as "*perfectly equivocal*;" and a passage brought before his reader for the purpose of fixing an idea of Popery in his mind, which did not constitute any part of my evidence on this subject; he will be inclined to think, perhaps, that my proof, upon the whole, was of so strong and unanswerable a nature, that Mr. O., not knowing how fairly to meet it, adopted the readiest method of disposing of it, by making it

pass as it were *sub silentio*, as proof not worthy his reader's attention: at least it will be concluded, that no want of "*common integrity*" can in this case attach to the author of "the Guide to the Church."

Indisposed to adopt Mr. O.'s language, I content myself with the statement of facts, leaving the judgment with my reader; in confidence, that the question with which Mr. O. has thought proper to conclude this section, "Why do our opponents continually weary us with such *equivocal* and *illegitimate* testimony?" will appear to be a question, which he must be astonished to find Mr. OVERTON asking, and to which Mr. OVERTON has certainly no right to expect an answer.

---

## SECTION II.

*The true Interpretation of the Articles further sought from the known private Sentiments of our Reformers.*

AS the title of the present Section promises to bring forward evidence of a kind similar to that which has been already produced; namely, of that *presumptive* kind, drawn from the writings of individuals, which can never stand in the place of *direct* and *positive* proof, by which alone the

controversy in question is to be determined; I might, after what has been so copiously advanced on this particular head, be fairly excused from entering into it.

But as I would not be thought to treat with disrespect the pages of a Clergyman, zealously engaged in the support of what he considers to be the cause of truth, I continue to pursue the method I have adopted, as the one most creditable to myself, as well as most satisfactory to my reader; by paying that attention to Mr. O.'s arguments on this subject to which they may seem to be entitled. How far Mr. O. is to be considered in the light of a close and logical reasoner, from the general manner in which his arguments are conducted, my reader will determine for himself. It is not my wish, either by indecent reflections upon the author, or unfair comment on his text, to undervalue Mr. O.'s publication, but fairly to appreciate it—*Valeat quantum valere potest.*

The present section commences with a kind of evidence, which does not bear on the point professed to be handled, by an appeal to what Mr. O. calls the *unanimous testimony* of men of all sentiments, for the purpose of proving our Articles to be *Augustinian*. Mr. O. then proceeds, it would seem on the ground of the common adage, that "what every one says must be true," to bring forward a catalogue of different writers as wit-

nesses, (namely, HUME, MOSHEIM, the conductors of the New Annual Register, the Critical Reviewers, Bishop BURNET, MACLAINE, STRYPE, WILSON, and SMOLLET) to prove, not the proposition with which Mr. O. opened this section; but that, according to HUME, "our first Reformers had embraced the most rigid tenets of predestination and absolute decrees;" and in the language of MOSHEIM, that "under the reign of EDWARD VI. Geneva was acknowledged as a sister Church, and the theological system then established by CALVIN was adopted, and rendered the public rule of faith, in England." P. 70. Now, should such authority be admitted to be of sterling weight, Mr. O.'s point is incontrovertibly established. But every one, duly conversant with our Church history, knows it to be light in the balance; because he must know the above statement relative to the Calvinistic tendency of our first Reformers to be most contrary to fact. It has been above observed, on the authority of HEYLIN, that CALVIN's assistance in the work of our Reformation was rejected by CRANMER; and that that of MELANCTHON, the decided opposer of the Calvinistic tenets, was accepted and highly valued by him. That CRANMER was in confidential intercourse with MELANCTHON, consulted him on the most important points, and drew the English Articles after the model of the Augsburg Confession; which is incompatible with CALVIN's rigid doctrine.

On the other hand, that CALVIN did write letters to England on the subject of the Reformation to the KING, the PROTECTOR SOMERSET, the Council, and CRANMER; but that little attention was paid to them. CALVIN himself complained of the little influence his counsels had in England on the minds of those who were desirous of adhering to the strict line of our Reformation. For, in answer to an appeal made to him from the English refugees in Francfort concerning the use of King EDWARD's Liturgy, after expressing his dislike of it, he concludes his letter in reference to those of the Refugees who were patrons of the English Liturgy, in the following complaining stile:—"But I speak in vain to them, which perchance esteem me not so well, as they will vouchsafe to admit the counsel that cometh from such an author." The reader will judge, therefore, how far the doctrine of the church of Geneva, as MOSHEIM calls it, was made the model for that of the Church of England.

But what does the same historian say in another part of his history? "Scarcely (says he) had the British divines returned from the Synod of Dort, and given an account of the laws that had been enacted, and the doctrines that had been established, by that famous assembly, than the King, together

\* "Sed ego frustra ad eos sermonem converto, qui forte non tantum mihi tribuunt, ut consilium a tale auctore profectum admittere dignentur." Calvinus Anglis Francford, G. D. Epist. p. 213.

with the greatest part of the Episcopal Clergy, discovered, in the strongest terms, their dislike of these proceedings; and judged the sentiments of ARMINIUS, relating to the divine decrees, preferable to those of GOMARUS and CALVIN." Every one knows, (says MOSHEIM, on the same occasion) that the peculiar doctrines, to which the victory was assigned by the synod of Dort, were *absolutely unknown* in the first ages of the Christian church." And what does Mr. O.'s favourite historian STRYPE, whose authority stands with him on the highest ground, say on the subject of the Calvinistic doctrine? "Till about the year 1595, (says STRYPE in his life of WHITGIFT, p. 435) CALVIN'S way of explaining the Divine decrees was not entertained by many learned men in the University of Cambridge; and although Calvinism prevailed much in his reign, yet it was not understood to be *certainly the sense of our Articles*, even by those who held this doctrine." Were I, however, to admit the unanimous testimony of all the writers here appealed to, which I *certainly* do not, for the most obvious reason; still, what does it contribute to the object of this section, which was to "seek the true interpretation of our Articles from the *private sentiments* of our Reformers," which are to be determined only by their *own writings*.

Mr. O., still wandering from his immediate subject, proceeds, in p. 72, to bring forward the vene-

table testimony of DAVENANT, CARLETON, HALL, WARD, USHER, and WHITAKER, by the mouth of their spokesman WHITAKER, in the following words: "The Church of England, (saith the eminent WHITAKER, speaking of the Calvinistic opinion) ever since the Gospel was restored, had always held this opinion," &c. But what is this but the assertion of a decided Calvinist, confident in his own opinion; and proves just as much as the opinion of Mr. O., or the still more confident opinion of *Presbyter*, who scruples not to affirm, "that the Articles are only capable of a Calvinistic sense." \* P. 29. Now admitting that DAVENANT, &c. were all *decided Calvinists*, how, it may be asked, does their opinion on this subject tend to ascertain the *private sentiments* of our original Reformers, who were old men before most of them, it is probable, were born. But, it is to be observed, four of these decided Calvinists, as they are represented to be, attended the Synod of Dort, and there bore public testimony against the rigid doctrines of Calvinism, by maintaining the doctrine of *universal* redemption, and the free agency of man, consistent with divine grace; the propositions offered by them to the Synod being these: †—First; "God, having com-

\* The Church of England vindicated, &c. by a Presbyter of the Church of England. Octavo, 1801.

† L. "Deus, lapsi humani generis miseratus, misit filium suum, qui seipsum dedit pretium redemptionis pro precatis totius mundi."



passion on the sinful race of men, sent his own Son, who gave himself a ransom for the sins of *the whole world*. II. In this merit of CHRIST's death is founded the *universal* promise of the Gospel, according to which *all* who believe in CHRIST may actually receive remission of sins and life eternal. III. As, according to this evangelical promise, salvation is offered to *all men*; the administration of God's grace in the Church is such as is sufficient to convince all impenitent and incredulous men, that they have perished, and forfeited the benefits offered them, through their own *voluntary* fault, and through neglect or contempt of the Gospel."

Should any doubt remain with respect to Bishop HALL, as Mr. O. refers to a letter written by him to Bishop DAVENANT, "freeing him from the charge of Arminianism;" from which the reader is led to conclude HALL to be a decided *Calvinist*; let the pious Bishop speak for himself. "When we say CHRIST died for mankind, we mean (says he) that CHRIST died for the benefit of mankind. Now let this benefit be distinguished, and contentions hereabouts will cease. For if this benefit be con-

II. In hoc merito mortis Christi fundatur *universale* promissum evangelicum, juxta quod *omnes* in Christum credentes remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam seipsâ consequantur. III. In Ecclesiâ, uti juxta hoc promissum evangelicum salus *omnibus* offertur, ea est administratio gratiæ suæ, quæ sufficit ad convincendum omnes impenitentes et incredulos, quod suâ culpâ *voluntaria*, vel neglectu, vel contemptu evangelii, perierint, et beneficia oblata amiserint."

sidered as the remission of sins, and the salvation of our souls; these are benefits obtainable only *upon the conditions of faith and repentance*: on the one side, no man will say, that CHRIST died to this end to procure forgiveness and salvation to every one, whether they believe or repent, or no. So, on the other, none will deny that he died to this end, that salvation and remission should redound to all and to *every one*, in case they should believe and repent. For this depends upon the sufficiency of that price, which our SAVIOUR paid for the redemption *of the world*." Vol. iii. p. 574.

The name which stands fifth in the number of these respectable divines, is that of Bishop USHER, who, though he lived in the Calvinistic persuasion, did not die in it. WHITAKER, therefore, of all the six divines here appealed to, is the only one whose testimony on the subject of Calvinism remains perfectly unimpeached. This kind of general appeal to the "*the unanimous testimony of men of all sentiments*, Mr. O. thus concludes; "Did these Calvinistical sentiments only obtain at *some future period* of our Church, with which our Reformers had no concern, and which consequently does not concern us? So some persons would have it believed." P. 73. From the evidence hitherto brought forward in this section, the reader is *certainly* not authorized to conclude that such was not actually the state of the case.

We, therefore, proceed to the second branch of this important section, which sets out with informing the reader, that "the fact, relative to the Calvinistical doctrine of Predestination prevailing among the first English Reformers," p. 70, (*a fact as yet unproved*) "is abundantly confirmed by the writings of the Reformers themselves," p. 73. At length, then, we are arrived at the point from which this section proposed to set out; for all that has been written hitherto, is a digression from the immediate subject in hand, and Mr. O. might have written a folio, on the same plan that he has written his last four pages, and proved nothing to his point. Here then, at least, the reader must have expected to have seen the names of our venerable Reformers brought forward, accompanied with appeals to their respective writings, for the purpose of ascertaining the point in question. But this is not the case. They are all passed over in silence; one single half page comprehends all that Mr. O. has to say about them; as if neither CRANMER, RIDLEY, nor LATIMER, had left behind them a single sentiment on record. So that the expectation held out to the reader in the title to this section sinks at last into a naked assertion, that all the writings of the Reformers, "to which Mr. O. has already referred, tend *directly* to the establishment of the point" under consideration, "and that the rest are in perfect consistency with it." P. 73. And, on the faith of the same naked asser-

tion, the reader is carried, as it were, *raptim*, through the reigns of EDWARD, ELIZABETH, JAMES, and CHARLES; taking it for granted, it should seem, that, from the "innumerable publications equally full to the purpose," p. 73, to be found, according to Mr. O.'s account, in those reigns, that the point which this section proposed to establish by the examination of private documents, has been decisively proved, without, at the same time, a single document having been produced. On this method of proving in the lump, a method adopted, as Mr. O. tells his reader, "*to avoid unnecessary prolixity*," (a circumstance to which Mr. O. appears to have paid attention on this occasion *in particular*) my reader will pass his own judgment. But it seldom happens, I believe, that a man fails to *particularize*, when *particulars* are decidedly in his favour. It will be unnecessary, therefore, to point out the reason why the writings of our Reformers were not particularly investigated on this occasion.

Mr. O. has, indeed, made mention of three publications—NOWELL'S Catechism, Lord BACON'S Confession, and TALBOT'S Petition. But that the *private sentiments* of our Reformers are to be ascertained by these, appears to be begging the point, instead of proving it. The *Non-Calvinism* of NOWELL'S Catechism, if we may use the expression, has been lately maintained by a bishop, who has particularly attended to this subject, and to whose opinion the

world will pay deference. I shall only, therefore, pass a remark on the mode of arguing applied by Mr. O. to this subject in p. 76. "How," says Mr. O., "*a confessedly Calvinistic Catechism*, circumstanced even as his Lordship represents this to have been, can afford an argument against the Calvinistic intention and interpretation of our Articles, some persons will not easily be convinced. How a Catechism, which, according to STRYPE, was reviewed, corrected, approved, allowed, and passed by both Houses of the same Convocation which reviewed and passed our Articles, can be supposed to contain any other doctrine than that in those Articles, such persons do not conceive." P. 76. But such persons might easily conceive how this came to pass, by only supposing that the sense which Calvinists see, both in our Articles, and in the Catechism in question, the Convocation which reviewed it, did not see. Mr. O., it is presumed, must know, that the validity of every conclusion depends upon the establishment of the premises from which it is drawn. Upon analyzing the above mode of reasoning, the reader will find Mr. O. assuming premises that ought first to have been proved, and then proceeding to his conclusion as regularly as if they had been proved. According to this mode of arguing, Mr. O. will have no difficulty in proving just what he pleases. If a Catechism, reviewed and passed by the same Convocation that reviewed and passed our Articles, be "*confessedly*

*Calvinistic*," it certainly cannot afford an argument *against*, but *for* the *Calvinistic* interpretation of those Articles; because it is to be taken for granted, that two public documents of such a nature, and for such a purpose, must, in doctrine, correspond with each other. But my reader has only to deny the *major* proposition in this hypothetical syllogism, and it immediately dissolves. "Give me," said the old philosopher, "but a place on which I may stand, and I will move the world." Grant Mr. O. but the  $\pi\alpha\varsigma\ \varsigma\omega$ , the position he assumes, and his conclusion will be incontrovertible.

I now pass on to the next method of proof, by which Mr. O. proposes to ascertain "the *private sentiments of our Reformers*," drawn from the "concessions and reasonings of avowed Arminians." P. 80. Bishop BURNET himself, confessedly an Arminian, is first brought forward. "The avowed object of his Exposition of the Articles," we are told by Mr. O., "was to prove them not Calvinistic," p. 80; and his laborious Exposition tended, according to Mr. O., "to assert expressly the whole matter for which Mr. O. contends." P. 81. On the authority of Bishop BURNET, then, the Articles are decidedly *Calvinistic*. The Bishop, therefore, according to Mr. O.'s statement, undertook his subject, for the express purpose of proving one thing, and executed it in such a manner as to prove another, in direct opposition to it. But it has been generally

considered, that BURNET, in his Exposition, did not mean to draw any determinate line of judgment on the subject of the Articles ; but, after a fair statement of the opinions that had been maintained on both sides, to leave his reader to draw a judgment for himself. This appears to be decidedly the plan he proposed to himself, in his Exposition of the 17th Article in particular. His own words are, “ I have not, in the explanation of the 17th, told what my opinion was ; yet here, I think, it may be fitting to own, that I follow the doctrine of the Greek Church (as taught by ORIGEN, CHRYSOSTOM, &c.) from which St. AUSTIN departed, and formed a *new system*.” Preface to 39 Articles, p. 6. Bishop BURNET, then, who, as Mr. O. observes, was “ considered at least as well qualified for his undertaking as any divine in the nation, after having duly weighed the arguments brought on each side in support of the *Arminian* and *Calvinistic* interpretation of the 17th Article, determines for himself in favour of the former. Bishop BURNET certainly thought, as others may think, that the Articles about Original Sin and Predestination might have been better expressed, without concluding that the manner in which those Articles are expressed, necessarily draws after it a *Calvinistic* interpretation. For Bishop B., speaking of the Articles in the conclusion of the History of his own Times, says expressly, “ I believe them all myself.” On the supposition, then,

that BURNET was an Arminian, he must, after having duly weighed the subject, have definitively concluded, that the *Arminian* sense was that in which the Articles should be believed, otherwise his subscription was not that of an honest man. Whatever weight, therefore, Bishop BURNET's settled opinion may have in the scale of judgment, appears to be in direct opposition of Mr. O.'s cause. BURNET did make some concessions on the subject, which every reader must weigh for himself. "It is *probable*," he says, "that they who penned this Article (the 17th) meant that the decree was *absolute*; but since they have not said it, those who subscribe the Articles, do not seem to be bound to any thing that is not expressed therein." What the Bishop here considers to be *probable*, many, judging from circumstances, as well as from the tenor of the Article in question, will consider to be next to *impossible*. The learned author of the *Inspector*, Dr. HALES, after quoting a passage in the *Reformatio Legum*, which corresponds with the 17th Article, writes thus:—"From this admirable archetype of the 17th Article, framed in the true spirit and uniform tenor of Holy Writ, (and also from the 16th) it might, perhaps, be questioned, whether Bishop BURNET has not conceded too much in asserting, that 'it is very probable that they who penned the Article, meant that the decree was *absolute*,' especially after what he further states in his Analysis of the Arguments of the Remonstrants."



After having quoted, therefore, that passage above brought forward, containing BURNET's private opinion on the subject of our Articles, Dr. HALES thus concludes:—"Hence it appears," says he, "that Bishop BURNET's sentiments, adopted by our most judicious divines, Dr. WATERLAND, Bishop PRETTYMAN, and Mr. DAUBENY, are nearly the same in substance; and to these respectable English authorities, I, as a member of the Church of Ireland, give my unfeigned assent and consent."\*

But after all, if Mr. O. had taken his estimate of Bishop BURNET's Exposition from the judgment pronounced upon it, by the great body of Clergy at the time of its first appearance, when the impression made by it was strong on the public mind, in consequence of its contents having been newly and scrupulously analyzed, he would not have thought that BURNET's authority could prove much, on which side soever it might be adduced. Mr. O., perhaps, may not know what Dr. BINKS has informed us, that "an humble representation by the Clergy of the Lower House of Convocation was laid before the Archbishop, and the Right Reverend his Comprovincials, touching Bishop BURNET's Exposition of the Articles, under the three following heads:—1. That the said book tends to introduce such a latitude and diversity of opinions, as the Ar-

\* Observations on Subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles, by W. HALES, D.D. Dublin.

Articles were made to avoid. 2. That there are many passages in the Exposition, which appear to them to be contrary to the true meaning of them, and to other received doctrines of our Church. 3. That there are some things in the said book, which seem to be of dangerous consequence to the Church of England, as by law established, and to derogate from the honour of its reformation." The design of the Church, from the title prefixed to the Articles, was to avoid diversity of opinions, that those who subscribed should agree in the things therein contained. "But Bishop BURNET," says Dr. BINKS, "instead of seconding the design of the Church, in compiling the Articles, has thought fit to expound them in such a manner, and introduces his Exposition with such a Preface and Preliminaries, as to make it very practicable for men of different opinions, as to the very things determined in the Articles, to make no difficulty of subscribing. The principle on which the Bishop's Exposition proceeds being this; that, if the words of the Article will bear a double grammatical sense, however opposite those senses may be to each other, a man may subscribe in his own sense, and be an honest man, and a good Churchman. The Bishop's words are these:—'An Article being conceived in such general words, that it can admit of different literal and grammatical senses, even when the senses given are plainly contrary one to another, both sides may subscribe the Article with a good

conscience, and without equivocation.' What Dr. BINKS has said on the subject more immediately under consideration, is so much to the purpose, that my reader will thank me for extending my extract.

"The ten middle Articles, from the 9th to the 19th contain a continued explanation or enlargement upon the most necessary part of our Christian faith. We have, in these Articles, the nature and consequence, as well of *original* as of *actual* sin. Our incapacity of doing any thing as of ourselves is acknowledged; that our sins must be forgiven us by the merits of JESUS CHRIST; we must be justified by CHRIST alone, and through faith in Him, in order to eternal life. It is He alone that calls us, and makes our peace with God. Here we are told how God did decree and purpose, from all eternity, those means of salvation to mankind for the sake of his SON. That, before the foundations of the world were laid, He pre-ordained man to life; calling, or electing, or choosing all such to be his adopted children, and vessels of honour, that should believe in his SON, and live according to the rules which he hath given us in the Gospel; and at the same time excluding all from the benefit of this eternal Predestination, Justification, and Election, who should reject these means of salvation thus tendered by CHRIST, and to be attained by faith in Him, and by no other means whatsoever. This is the whole of what is contained in all those ten Articles, and is

the substance of several Homilies; and nothing truly controversial or disputable about *absolute* decrees, or the efficacy of God's grace, but plain necessary truths will be found to be here laid down and asserted. Some few scholastic terms, indeed, (as the known language of the learned of those times) do sometimes occur. But if we carefully examine every proposition, and do not go about to lay weight upon single words, and draw inferences from them, such as *Predestination, Election, Vessels of Honour*, and the like; if we only look to what is fairly affirmed or denied, and go no further; we shall not meet with any one proposition in all the ten Articles, but what every orthodox Christian will be ready to subscribe, let them vary never so in their sentiments. Here is really nothing but solid divinity, wherein all men in a manner agree, that are not favourers of PELAGIUS or SOCINUS. So that, upon a due examination of the matter, my Lord of S. will be found to have spent a great deal of time and pains upon the middle set of Articles to little purpose; and particularly in his exposition of the 17th Article of Predestination and Election, (wherein he seems to think he has done his best) he will be found to shoot all the while at rovers, and wide of the mark, loading the Article with questions which do not belong to it, and scarce saying any thing of what it really and truly imports.

“ In some other countries a great deal of stress may have been laid upon some abstruse notions, wherein the terms of art may be the same as our Articles make use of, or they are at least made to be the titles of them, (though they are also scriptural, and for that reason, therefore, chiefly retained ; ) such as *Justification, Election, Predestination, &c.* And about them the Lutheran and Calvinist shall have hot disputes. But these points which make so much noise abroad, our Church says nothing of at all ; she is always silent as to what their quarrel is about, and would have all her children be so too. The meddling with Fatality, and Prescience, and Reprobation, and other such matters, as handled by foreign divines, is what hath been often forbid, and is always discountenanced by our Church. Nor is there any thing to be found in any of the Articles, which, being asserted, does naturally engage a subscriber to concern himself about them ; and they that from words only, and modes of expression, go about to draw any of our Articles into those quarrels, do our Church a great deal of wrong. It is the effect of moderation in our Church to avoid determining such over nice questions, as have occasioned those unhappy divisions ; things about which men may dispute to the world’s end, and be never the wiser ; and which, after all, there is no occasion for men so nicely to enquire into, as to make them so much as any part of their study, so far as Christi-

anity is concerned. The method our Church hath taken, is to keep to such doctrines and positions as are *scriptural*. And whoever makes any of our Articles to be transcribed and copied from *St. Austin*, or from any other uninspired writer, very much mistakes the matter. Those very Articles my Lord of S. points out, were in all likelihood intended to be a transcript from the scriptures in general, and from *St. PAUL* in particular, and from no one else.\*

From the above extract it appears, that what Mr. O. has said respecting Bishop BURNET's Exposition, does by no means correspond with the opinion formed on that subject by the great body of divines of the time. Mr. O. considers Bishop BURNET to have been employed as an Arminian, to prove our Articles *not Calvinistic*. "It is most certain then," says Mr. O., "that BURNET would admit nothing on the other side of the question, but what he was constrained to do by the force of the most manifest truth." Therefore, concludes Mr. O., from BURNET's concessions on the side of Calvinism, there cannot remain a doubt that "our first Reformers were in the sublapsarian hypothesis." Thus reasons Mr. O. from his own premises. But Dr. BINKS, and the great body of the Clergy, who lived at the time, and who must at least be as well acquainted with BURNET's motives on this occasion

\* Prefatory Discourse to an Examination of BURNET's Exposition, by Dr. BINKS dean of Lichfield, 1702.

as Mr. O., represent the principle on which his Exposition proceeds, to be in the utmost degree latitudinarian; its object not being to affix any precise meaning to our Articles, but to render them as comprehensive as possible. An Exposition which appears to have had more of *policy* in it than *religion*; and places BURNET's authority in that questionable point of view, as to render it inadequate to the establishment of the present point.

The next witness brought forward to prove the sense of our Articles by the private sentiments of our Reformers is Dr. HEYLIN; who tells the reader, that there was a great tendency (though Mr. O. does not say at what *particular period*) unto CALVIN's opinions "in our Universities, and that he had no good assurance of any man in the University of Oxford, who publicly opposed the Calvinian tenets, till after the beginning of JAMES's reign." P. 82. HEYLIN is here speaking of the state of religious controversy in our Universities at the latter end of ELIZABETH's and the beginning of JAMES's reign, "Mr. PRYN," says he, "with all his diligence could find but seven men who publicly maintained any point of Calvinism in the schools of Oxon from the year 1596 to the year 1616." He then proceeds to admit, that, "by error of these times, the reputation which CALVIN had attained in both Universities, and the extreme diligence of his followers for the better carrying on

their own designs, there was a general tendency unto his opinions in the present controversies." But though HEYLIN confesses "that he had found no good assurance of any men who publicly opposed the Calvinian tenets in Oxford, till after the beginning of King JAMES's reign," yet he observes, in the conclusion of the same sentence, (what Mr. O. should not have omitted) that "there were some who spared not to declare their dislike thereof, and secretly trained up their scholars in other principles. An argument whereof may be, that when Dr. BAROE died in London, (which was about three or four years after he had left his place in Cambridge) his funeral was attended by most of the divines then living in and about the city, Dr. BANCROFT, then bishop of London, giving order in it; which plainly shews, that there were many of both Universities, which openly favoured BAROE's doctrines, and did as openly dislike those of the Calvinians, though we find but few presented to us by their names."—*Heylin Quinq. History, p. 626.*

From whence it appears, that HEYLIN is here brought to prove the very position, which it was his express object to counteract; namely, that which had been occasionally advanced, relative to the small number of persons who had publicly opposed the Calvinian tenets previous to the reign of JAMES. And this object could not have escaped the notice of the reader, had he attended to the heads of



HEYLIN's chapter, now supposed to be before him; the 9th section of which, from whence Mr. O.'s extract is partly taken, professes to give "an answer touching the *paucity* of those who opposed CALVIN's doctrines." What Mr. O. says from HEYLIN on this occasion, is calculated to leave an idea on the mind of his reader, very different from that intended to be conveyed by the page of the historian himself. To do this, the language of the historian is grossly mutilated, and the precise period of time to which his observation, relative to "the general tendency unto CALVIN's opinions," applies, kept out of sight. My reader, therefore, after having remarked this partial statement of the historian's testimony, for the apparent purpose of making him bear witness as it were against himself, in favour of a cause to which he was professedly adverse, will not be surprised to find the suppression of the Lambeth Articles (a circumstance which constituted a prominent feature of that period to which the historian was then adverting, and as such introduced into the Chapter, from which Mr. O. has quoted on this occasion) passed over by him unnoticed. The idea intended to be left upon the reader's mind from Mr. O.'s appeal to HEYLIN, appears to be this—that the sentiments of our Reformers (supposed to be Calvinistic) generally prevailed, without opposition, till the beginning of JAMES's reign. Whereas the testimony of the historian, in Mr. O.'s

mutilated edition of it, amounts only to this—that there was a general tendency to CALVIN's opinions in the controversies that took place about the latter end of Queen ELIZABETH's, and the beginning of JAMES's, reign; and that in Oxford no publick opposition had been made to them till after the beginning of JAMES's reign. Admitting both these facts, they prove nothing to the immediate point in question; whilst the publick rejection of the Lambeth Articles in Queen ELIZABETH's reign decidedly proves against the idea here apparently meant to be conveyed. But after all, the circumstance of no publick opposition having been made to the Calvinian tenets previous to the reign of JAMES furnishes, to me at least, a proof the very reverse to that which Mr. O. appears to draw from it. For my conclusion from it is, that the Calvinian tenets formed no part of the originally-established doctrines of our Church, but were corruptions, which, by degrees, became as it were grafted upon them; and therefore, being considered by divines as not necessarily connected with the essential doctrines of Christianity, they were not firmly opposed, till by being made offensively obtrusive, they called aloud for some seasonable check. Upon this ground, as the subject strikes me, and with the view of restoring our Church doctrines to their primitive standard, were the Calvinian tenets opposed at the period here under consideration. On the same ground they are, and ever will be opposed by

all sound members of our Church; when, instead of constituting the private persuasion of pious individuals, they challenge, as they did at the period above alluded to, the distinction of being acknowledged to be an essential part of our public confession. From this proof drawn from the testimony of HEYLIN, such as it is, Mr. O. passes, in his usual stile of proving, what he generally leaves *unproved*, to the reign of CHARLES I., for the establishment of the object he professes to have before him in this section. His reader is therefore given to understand, on the authority of the same historian, that “since the resettling of the Church under ELIZABETH, to the period when the royal proclamation was issued by CHARLES, the maintainers of the Anti-Calvinian doctrines are but few in number, and make but a very thin appearance, that “*apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto.*” Mr. O. reduces their number even to four or five in more than half a century. A respect for Mr. O.’s professional character obliges me to conclude, that he has adopted, in this instance, some second-hand authority, instead of deducing his information from the original source. HEYLIN, in the page from which the above extract is partly taken, is “answering the objections touching the *paucity* of those authors produced by him in maintenance of the Anti-Calvinian or old English doctrines; since the resettling the Church under ELIZABETH; for (continues the historian) though

they be but few in number, and make but a very thin appearance," that is, as he has just observed, "though we find but few presented to us by their names, yet serve they for a good assurance that the Church still kept possession of her *primitive truths*, not utterly lost, though much endangered by such contrary doctrines as had of late been thrust upon her." And then, after having observed that there was a time, when few or none of the orthodox Bishops durst openly appear in favour of St. ATHANASIUS, the historian thus concludes his chapter: "Such an answer I must make, in the present case, to such as take up testimony by *tale*, not *weight*, and think no truth is fairly proved, except it come attended with a cloud of witnesses. But what we want in number *now*, the reader shall find hereafter, when we shall come to take a view of King JAMES's reign, to which we now hasten."—*Heylin*, p. 627. No mention (it is to be observed) is here made of the proclamation by CHARLES I., the attention of the historian being professedly confined to the reign of ELIZABETH; that period of time, therefore, which Mr. O. in his page protracts from the re-settling of the Church under ELIZABETH to the period when the proclamation was issued by CHARLES I., must consequently be abridged of nearly one half of its duration.

It is for Mr. O. to consider, how far the evidence which HEYLIN has been made to contribute towards

the establishment of the position here maintained, relative to the general prevalence of the Calvinian tenets, "for more than half a century after the resettling our Church under Elizabeth," has been "rendered strong and invincible by the harmony and support of all its parts, and interpreted as it would be by plain honest men of sound understanding and sufficient information." Preface, p. 8. From premises, however, thus incorrectly stated, Mr. O. proceeds to the following conclusion: "What an argument does all this afford, when, as in the present enquiry, not what was the truth, but what was the *prevailing sentiment*, is the question?" P. 83. The question under immediate consideration, to which the present section proposes to give an answer, is, not what was the *prevailing sentiment* of our divines, at any given period, on the subject of our Articles; but what was the *true interpretation* of them, as it was capable of being ascertained by the "*private sentiments of our Reformers*." If it was Mr. O.'s object to ascertain the prevailing sentiments of the divines at the latter end of Queen ELIZABETH's, and in the commencement of King JAMES's reign, his argument on this occasion, admitting his statement of facts to be just, (which, by the way, is very far from being the case) would have force in it. But his professed object being to ascertain the sense of our Articles, by the *private sentiments* of our Reformers, it has no force at all. For in this case Mr. O. com-

pleatly inverts the order of proof which ought to have been adopted on this occasion, and by which alone his conclusion was to be established. Instead of reasoning forward, from the private sentiments of our Reformers, to that sense of the Articles proposed to be proved by them; Mr. O. reasons backward, from the prevailing sentiments of the subscribers, to the meaning of Articles, which had been established, according to Mr. O.'s statement, half a century or more before their subscription took place. This is certainly not to ascertain the true interpretation of the Articles by the known private sentiments of our Reformers, a standard to which we readily appeal; but to attempt to ascertain that interpretation by the prevailing sentiments of those divines, whom we consider to have notoriously departed from it. Was I to admit, therefore, every thing that Mr. O., having changed his ground, now says he contends for, namely, the *prevailing sentiment* of our divines at a certain period, a point certainly not worth contending for; such an admission would contribute nothing to the establishment of that point, which the section before the reader professed to make out. Much more decisive evidence than what has been hitherto brought forward, must be produced, before we shall feel ourselves justified in giving up the Anti-Calvinistic principles of our *original* Reformers.

Mr. O. proceeds :—" Still Mr. D. will have it, that Calvinism was not entertained by many learned men of the University of Cambridge till the year 1595." P. 83. To this I answer, that my will had nothing to do with this matter one way or the other; the object before me in my Letter was to state facts. And the fact stated in this case, as it is above introduced, was from STRYPE, whose authority Mr. O. admits, but to whose testimony on this subject, he seems to be a perfect stranger. From this fact it certainly does appear, that Calvinism had gained ground in this kingdom toward the latter end of Queen ELIZABETH's reign. " Admit, then," says Mr. O., " that some of the great characters employed in re-settling the Church, on the accession of ELIZABETH, had acquired a greater relish for these (Calvinistic) doctrines than they had before; still these characters must be classed among our principal Reformers: still this was the period when the doctrines, which are binding upon us, were legally established."

This is more than can be admitted. The historic fact, as stated by STRYPE, which corresponds with the account above given from HEYLIN, warrants no such conclusion. The Calvinistic tenets, *according to* STRYPE, did not prevail till about the year 1595. Those divines, consequently, who were *then* tinctured with them, cannot be classed with the great characters employed in re-settling the Church, on the accession of Elizabeth, which took place about thirty-

seven years before that period. Still Mr. O. seems determined to establish this position, whether it be admitted or not. For he thus proceeds in the next page: "Yes, Mr. D., the particular period in which you and your colleagues allow these doctrines were prevalent, includes the *very period* when our Articles were made what they now are, and legally imposed, as well as a whole century afterward. The large portion of the great body of the Clergy of our Church you speak of as favouring such sentiments, includes the *very men* who thus formed and imposed these Articles." P. 85.

As every writer best knows his own meaning, he is, therefore, best qualified to speak for himself. On this head I would observe, that when I say, in p. 198 of the Appendix, that, "at a *particular period*, a large portion of the great body of the Clergy of our Church were Calvinistically inclined, I did not mean to speak of 'a *whole century*,' but of that *particular period* specified in p. 231 of the same Letter, on the authority of STRYPE, namely, 'about the year 1595.' In what sense the period about 1595, can be said to *include the very period* when our Articles were established, namely in 1552, and ultimately in 1562, I must leave Mr. O. to explain. To me the language is not less unintelligible, than is the idea apparently meant to be conveyed by it contrary to notorious facts.



There is still one passage in this page, which remains to be noticed:—"We shall say no more here (says Mr. O.) respecting the works of HENRY the VIIIth's time, of which so much use is made for this purpose. From these writings, it has clearly appeared, they may equally prove, that our Church holds many of the distinguishing peculiarities of Popery; and their very recurrence to such illegitimate testimony, affords no mean evidence of their lack of better, and that their case is a bad one." This is a stile of writing to which Mr. O. seems to be particularly attached. Was I disposed to imitate it, Mr. O. has furnished abundant ground for it in that weak string of arguments which I have been obliged already to wade through in the course only of the present section: and it would be paying my reader no compliment, after what has been said above, relative to the "*Popish heterogeneous works of HENRY VIII.*," and the *legitimacy* and *illegitimacy* of their evidence, as differently applicable to Mr. O.'s use of them and to my own, to detain him longer on this head.

At length one of our Reformers, Bishop HOOPER, is brought forward for the purpose of furnishing the reader with a passage from his writings, which Mr. O., through the medium of his own comment, endeavours to make speak a Calvinistic language. My reader will judge of the success of the experiment. The fundamental tenet of Calvinism, as my

reader has seen above, is, that “ the final condition of every man is absolutely determined, before he is born into the world.”\* Bishop HOOPER is brought forward for the purpose of an experiment being made on his writings, whether he may not be considered as having subscribed to this principle. The Bishop says, “ It is not a Christian’s part to attribute his salvation to his own *free will* :”—therefore, the Bishop was no *Pelagian*. “ Nor to extenuate original sin :”—therefore, the Bishop maintained that doctrine :—“ nor to make God the author of evil, or our damnation :”—therefore, the Bishop was no *Manichee*. “ Nor to say God hath wrote fatal laws, as the Stoics, and with necessity of destiny violently pulleth one by the hair into Heaven, and thrusteth the other headlong into Hell :”—therefore, HOOPER was no Calvinist or fatalist. “ The cause of any man’s rejection or damnation,” according to HOOPER, “ is sin in man, who will not hear nor receive the promise of the Gospel.” The cause of any man’s rejection, according to CALVIN, is, because, God having determined his condition before he was born, He prepares him for it accordingly, by giving him ears that he shall not hear, and consequently shall have no will to receive the Gospel: but that being by God’s determined purpose, rendered deaf and blind, and stupid, he might, as an *organ of Divine*

\* “ *Antequam nascantur homines, sua cuique fors arcano Dei arbitrio assignatur.*” *Calv. Com. on Rom. ix. 14.*

wrath, ' come to his proper end.' *In finem suum perveniat.*" *Instit. lib. iii. c. 24, p. 12.*

There can be no doubt thus far, then, with respect to the *Anti-Calvinistic* principles of Bishop HOOVER. But the bishop is a favourer of the Calvinistic scheme, Mr. O. maintains, although he is neither a *Manichee* or a *Stoic*. Because, " Calvinists do not hold that there is an *independent evil principle*, nor do they ascribe what happens in human affairs to an *immutable destiny*, resulting from the influence of matter, or from no man knows what, by which God himself is restrained; but to the appointment of a Supreme Governor, of infinite wisdom, power, goodness, and perfection, with a view to his own *glory*, and the *greatest possible ultimate good of his creatures*." P. 89. " We call (says CALVIN) predestination the eternal decree of God, by which He has determined with himself, what he would have done with every man. For all are not created under the same circumstances; to some life eternal, to others eternal damnation, is pre-ordained. Therefore, as every one is created to one or other of these ends, so we say, that he is predestinated either to life or death,"\* The only difference, then, between the supposed im-

\* " Prædestinationem vocamus æternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit, quid de unoquoque homine fieri vellet. Non enim pari conditione creantur omnes: sed aliis vita æterna, aliis damnatio æterna præordibatur. Itaque prout in alterutrum finem quisque conditus est, ita vel ad vitam vel ad mortem prædestinatum dicimus." *Instit. lib. iii. c. 21, 7.*

mutable destiny of the Stoics, and that of J. CALVIN, appears to be in the *cause* of it; for the *effects* of immutable destiny must be the same. The immutable destiny of the Stoic "results from the influence of matter, or from no man knows what;" whilst the immutable destiny of Calvinists is "ascribed to the appointment of a Supreme Governor of infinite wisdom." But it is immutable destiny still. And it must be left to Calvinists to make out, how this *immutable destiny*, by which far the greatest part of mankind are doomed by their Creator to endless destruction, can promote "the greatest possible ultimate good of his creatures." P. 89.

But Bishop HOOPER says, that "the cause of our election is the mercy of GOD in CHRIST; for therefore we are elected, because afterward we are made members of CHRIST." P. 87. <sup>Therefore,</sup> concludes Mr. O., Bishop HOOPER must be a Calvinist. Mr. O. takes it for granted, then, that there can be no other election, but *Calvinistic election*. This, by the way, is exactly the same stile of proof Mr. TOPLADY, of Calvinistic memory, used to adopt; who, wherever he met with the words, *our, elect, chosen, predestinate, will, purpose, &c.* never failed to affix to them a Calvinistic sense. This it is to see the Bible through a Calvinistic medium, which possesses the faculty of making, as occasion may require, straight things crooked, and crooked things straight.

But the decided *Anti-Calvinism* of Bishop HOOPER has been already proved: therefore, the *election* here spoken of by him, whatever it may mean, certainly cannot mean *Calvinistic* election. It, probably, referred to the original plan laid in the Divine councils before the world began, relative to the redemption of fallen man, the whole of which turns on the mercy of GOD in CHRIST; and, according to which, some nations and people have been elected to the privileges of the Gospel Covenant, whilst others have been passed by. According to this idea, our Church considers every person by baptism as admitted into the number of GOD's "faithful and *elect* children," and as thereby "made a member of CHRIST."

But to prevent a shadow of doubt from remaining on this subject, I will furnish my reader with another quotation from HOOPER's writings, \* which Mr. O. must have seen in the Appendix, p. 208, but of which he has taken no notice; because, *apparently*, it did not so well suit his purpose: upon which my reader shall be left to make his own comment:—"As far as extendeth the virtue and strength of GOD's promise to save men, as the rigour and justice of the law for sin to damn men; for as by the sin and offence of one man death was extended and made common unto all men, unto condemnation; (as PAUL saith, *Rom. v.*) so, by the justice of

\* Preface to his Exposition.

one, is derived life *unto all men*, unto justification. If all, then, shall be saved, what is to be said of those that St. PETER speaketh of, that shall perish for their false doctrine? And likewise CHRIST saith, that the gate is straight that leadeth to life, and few enter. *Matt. vii.* Thus the scripture answereth; that the promise of grace appertaineth *unto every sort of men* in the world, and comprehendeth them all: howbeit, within certain limits and bounds, the which if men neglect or pass over, *they exclude themselves* from the promise in CHRIST; as CAIN was no more excluded, till he excluded himself, than ABEL; SAUL, than DAVID; JUDAS, than PETER; ESAU, than JACOB." To which may be added the Bishop's comment on the text of St. JOHN: 'No man cometh unto me, except my Father draw him.' *John vi. 44.* "Many," saith the Bishop, "understand these words in a wrong sense, as if GOD required no more in a reasonable man than in a dead post, and mark not the words which follow; 'Every man that heareth and learneth of my Father, cometh unto me, &c.' GOD draweth with his word and the Holy Ghost, but man's duty is to hear and learn; that is to say, to receive the grace offered, *consent to the promise*, and *not to impugn the GOD that calleth.*"

But Mr. O. thinks, that the only object HOOPER had before him, was to "guard against the abuses or misrepresentation of the Calvinistic doctrines" p. 91; "and that the same was the object in view

with MELANCTHON, LATIMER, HALL, and the *Reformatio Legum.*”

But the reader will judge from the passages above produced, and from the tenour of the Augsburg Confession, referred to as the work of MELANCTHON, whether the Calvinistic doctrine *itself* was not the thing meant to be guarded against, not merely the abuse or misrepresentation of it. To prove that MELANCTHON's objection was to the *Calvinistic* doctrine of election *itself*, and not merely to the consequences deducible from it, my reader must be informed, that in the year 1552, when our Articles were originally set forth, he expunged with his own hand the Article *de Electione* out of a copy of CALVIN, of which CALVIN complained in the following passage of a Letter, written from Geneva, bearing date, 4 Cal. Dec. 1552.\* Many other proofs to the same effect, if necessary, might be brought forward from the *Loci Theologici* of MELANCTHON; a book of known repute with the divines of that age, inasmuch that Bishop BULE, on observing the strict correspondence between HOOPER's sentiments and those of MELANCTHON on these subjects, concludes his observation upon it with the following remark: “Who is there but

\* Audio enim, cum tota oblata esset formula nostræ cum Tigurina Ecclesia consensionis, protinus abrepto calamo sententiam unam, quæ Dei electos a reprobis parè et sobriè discernit, abs te esse confossum.—Calvinus Melancthoni, S. D. Genevæ, 4 Cal. Dec. 1552.

must acknowledge; that our HOOPER had drawn from MELACTHON's fountain." \*

The *Reformatio Legum* was a cotemporary work with our Articles; it is to be expected, therefore, that it should speak a language strictly correspondent with them. That it does so, will be found by an appeal to the Chapter *de Predestinatione*, which the learned Dr. HALES, as we have already seen, styles "the admirable archetype of the 17th Article." This Chapter treats first of that *particular* election and rejection, or *reprobation*, which, under the direction of the Devil, *duce Diabolo*, led men into despair; or carelessness of living. Such is the *Calvinistic* doctrine on this subject, and such have been often the effects of it. Having expressly guarded against this damnable doctrine, (as it may be emphatically called) the Christian proceeds to speak of that doctrine of predestination and election, which those who are properly learned in the sacred scriptures maintain, but in a *general and indefinite* way; and concludes with referring the reader for the direction of his conduct, not to any decrees of predestination, but to GOD's laws; since it is evident from the sacred scriptures, that promises to good men, and threatenings to evil men, are of a *general kind*. "Cum et promissiones bonis, minas malis, in sacris scrip-

\* "Quis jam non agnoscit, Hooperum nostrum ex Melancthone sapuisse?"



*turis generaliter propofitas contemplentur.*”—Cap. 22, *De Predestinatione.*

Our 17th Article, if properly analyzed, will be found to have been constructed after this model. It begins with speaking of *predestination* nearly in the language of scripture; but without annexing to it any *precise definition*. “Our Reformers,” as RIDLEY expressed it, “fearing to speak further, yea almost none otherwise, than the very text, did, as it were, lead them by the hand.” This the Article calls a *godly doctrine*; administering comfort to the faithful Christian. The Article then proceeds to guard against that *Calvinistic* sense of predestination, which it calls “the *sentence* of GOD’s predestination,” so opposite to the godly consideration of this subject described in the first part of the Article, that (in the exact language of the *Reformatio Legum*) it is that damnable doctrine, “whereby the Devil doth thrust them into despair, or wretchedness of most unclean living.” Here, then, the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination is *particularly* guarded against; whilst the conclusion of the Article is intended to guard against it *generally*, by directing the Christian to let the scriptures constitute the standard for his judgment on this subject, by receiving “the promises of GOD in such wise as they are set forth in holy scripture.”

Having thus attended Mr. O. through his general course of proof, by which he professed to ascer-

tain “ the true interpretation of our Articles by the private sentiments of our Reformers ;” I at length arrive at his conclusion drawn in the 91st page in the following words:—“ On all hands, therefore, does it thus *unquestionably* appear, how generally these sentiments (namely, *Calvinistic* ) were entertained by the founders of our Church, which are now represented as a ‘ curious conceit,’ ‘ a system of nonsense,’ ‘ an artifice of the Devil,’ a ‘ doctrine which carries its own condemnation upon the face of it,’ ‘ as synonymous with fatalism,’ ‘ makes God a tyrant,’ ‘ lays the axe at once to the root of all religion,” ‘ is full of barbarity and blasphemy ;’ and strange to say, thus represented too by those who fill high stations in the Church, by those who profess to adhere to the genuine doctrines of her Reformers.” P. 91.

Most of the above extracts are taken from my writings; and applied, as they are, to the Calvinistical doctrine of absolute unconditional decrees, I do not wish to withdraw a word from them, that might tend in any degree to weaken their force. This doctrine our Article describes under the title of the *sentence* of God’s predestination; as an artifice of the Devil, by which “ he thrusts men into despair,” into carelessness or uncleanness of living; as such it is a doctrine against which every faithful minister of God should decidedly set his face. Such, however, is the doctrine which Mr. O. here supports,

considering it to be confirmed by the sentiments of the founders of our Church. How far this has been made *unquestionably* to appear, and how far those "who profess to adhere to the *genuine* doctrines of our Reformers," are justified in rejecting what they consider in no other light than as a corrupt addition to them; every intelligent reader, from what has been brought before him, in the course of the present section, must be qualified to judge.

Mr. O. appears now to have done with argument; for in his next page he assumes a different stile of writing. But as *sneering* is not argument, I leave Mr. O. in full possession of the field on which he enters in his 92d page, because I cannot fight upon it; not having (as HOOPER says on another occasion) "been nursed and trained to it." The page, however, shall be given *verbatim* to the reader, that I may not be suspected of keeping any of the strong parts of Mr. O.'s publication out of sight.

"There is however, it must be confessed, a discovery made by Mr. DAUBENY, which, if it be just, forms a considerable objection to our conclusion: 'But, Sir,' says this writer to his opponent, 'I shall not do justice to the 17th Article, if I do not observe further, that so far from being intended to favour the *Calvinistic* doctrine, it appears to me to furnish *the most decisive evidence against it.*' Poor deluded historians, ancient and modern, foreign and domestic, who, with one voice, have told us, that

our public confessions are formed on the Augustinian or Calvinian plan! Poor unfortunate Bishop BURNET, who, when employed by his Queen, and the great Metropolitan, for the very opposite purpose, has said, ‘ It is not to be denied, but that the Article seems to be framed according to St. AUSTIN’s doctrine;’ that although, in his judgment, others might subscribe to it, yet ‘ that the Calvinists have less occasion for scruple, since the Article does seem more plainly to favour them;’ ‘ and that the very cautions that are added to it, do likewise intimate that St. AUSTIN’s doctrine was designed to be settled by the Article.’ Poor good-natured Arminians, who have made so many undue *concessions*, and have so laboured to account for this circumstance; ascribing it to the Marian exile, and a desire to comprehend the Calvinists, that ‘ some of the compilers of the Articles were Calvinists.’ Poor short-sighted simpletons all together, who, for two hundred and thirty-seven years, have been doting about the Calvinistic tendency of our Articles; when, after all, the very Article upon which this opinion has been chiefly founded, furnishes the *most decisive evidence against it!* Well may Mr. DAUBENY be represented as ‘ indisputably the *very foremost*, or among the foremost writers of the age.’ Well may it be triumphantly concluded, that ‘ Calvinists will hardly attempt to *reason* with him.’ With the man, who can view such an Article in such a light, considered

under all its circumstances, and in connection with what has been the prevailing opinion of persons of all persuasions upon it, it is certainly in vain to reason."

P. 90.

To me it appears, that Mr. O. would have shewn more wisdom in disproving what the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers had said relative to no "Calvinists attempting to reason with Mr. DAUBENY," by refuting by fair argument the position laid down by him on the subject in question, than by writing the foregoing page, which proves nothing. As Mr. O., however, does not profess to reason with me, (and in the present case I am inclined to think for the best of all possible reasons) it will not be expected that I should reason with him; otherwise it might have been observed, that the private opinion of "deluded historians, or of Bishop BURNET, respecting the proposed plan on which our Articles were framed, *proved* nothing." Other men, better informed, perhaps, than those historians, and not less learned, have thought very differently. Nor do the concessions of good-natured Arminians, "poor short-sighted simpletons," (as Mr. O. frequently calls them) who, we are told, have been doting for two hundred and thirty-seven years about the Calvinistic tendency of our Articles, whilst it is well-known that, for the last one hundred and fifty years of that time, the great body of the English clergy have been of a very opposite persuasion, determine any thing in this case;

all, the Articles must be tried by themselves, according to their literal and grammatical sense.

In this manner, in the 4th letter of my Appendix, the 17th Article was tried on the ground of this self-evident proposition; that, as a composition designed for the use of the Christian ministry, it must convey one determined sense, and could not contradict itself. Proceeding on this plan, the position laid down was this: that the 17th Article, so far from being intended to favour the *Calvinistic* doctrine, furnished the most decisive internal evidence against it. And the position, which Mr. O. describes as a discovery, was proved in the following manner:—The 17th Article gives a scriptural description of predestination, considered as the mercy of God in Christ, for the benefit of fallen man; that by becoming an interesting object of contemplation, it might, thus rightly contemplated, tend to the more effectual promotion of the Evangelical plan of salvation, by disposing faithful Christians to rest satisfied, that according to “the eternal purpose which God hath purposed in Christ Jesus, their labour would not be in vain in the LORD.”

By the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, is understood the absolute unconditional election of certain individuals to eternal life; and the absolute reprobation of all not included in that chosen number; in consequence of which predestination,

all labour in the work of salvation must be vain. But election and reprobation in the Calvinistic system are *correlatives*; and as such must necessarily go together. Reprobation, then, as inseparably connected with the doctrine of predestination in the Calvinistic sense, could not have been omitted in an Article purposely designed to convey that sense. But *reprobation* has no necessary connection with predestination, considered as the everlasting purpose of God, relative to the covenant of grace in CHRIST. The circumstance, therefore, of its being *totally omitted* in the 17th Article, coupled with the consideration of a clause being inserted for the express purpose of guarding against such an idea, appears to warrant the conclusion, that the Article was unquestionably meant to be taken in the latter sense.

Such was my argument on this subject. If it has strength in it, the language of irony cannot take it away. When the Editors of the Anti-Jacobin Review concluded that Calvinists would hardly attempt to reason on this subject, they doubtless meant what they said. And Mr. O.'s running off the ground, without making any attempt to reason on this occasion, will, perhaps, be considered as a proof in point, in confirmation of their judgment. For, it is probable, many readers will understand Mr. O.'s language, where he says, that "with the man who can view the Article in such a light, it is certainly *in*

*vain to reason,*" not in the exact sense in which it was meant to be understood.

But however light my reasoning may weigh in Mr. O.'s scale, it possesses some degree of weight in that of a divine who, from his acknowledged abilities, will be admitted to be no incompetent judge. The learned author of the *Inspector*, in his observations on the 4th Letter of the Appendix to the Guide, has done me the honour to write thus: "He (Mr. DAUBENT) shews by evidence, absolutely incontrovertible, that CRANMER, RIDLEY, LATIMER, and HOOPER, who chiefly projected and completed the Reformation of our Church, were not themselves Calvinists." And then, after having made copious extracts from the Letter, and advertising particularly to the subject of the 17th Article, the learned writer thus concludes: "These few extracts from Mr. D.'s meritorious and seasonable publication, supported by the high authority of Bishop BURNET, will, I trust, be deemed full, perfect, and sufficient for the exculpation of that admirable, though improveable *form of sound words* contained in our Articles, and of the venerable framers of them, from the injurious, though prevailing imputation of Calvinism; an imputation indolently and implicitly acquiesced under by too many of the Clergy, who ought to know better things." \*

\* Observations on Subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles, by W. HALES, D.D. Dublin.



It is not, however, my wish to bolster up weak arguments by any authority, however respectable. If they have not strength to support themselves, let them fall. Should, therefore, my reasoning be such, as, in the judgment of Mr. O., not to be entitled to answer; still, he should consider, as many readers may not see it in the same light, that, to do justice to his own cause, he ought not to omit the exposition of it. As an encouragement so to do, I engage, in case Mr. O. can by fair argument, and a legitimate interpretation of the 17th Article, in consistency with itself and the language of our Liturgy, make it speak the sense of J. CALVIN on the subject of predestination, that I will subscribe to his creed.

We are at length arrived at the conclusion of this Chapter, professing to ascertain the true sense of our Articles, and the genuine doctrines of our Reformers; which Mr. O. winds up by telling his readers, that nothing is further from his purpose, "than to infer, from what has been advanced in this section, that the precise theological system of J. CALVIN in all its parts, and to its full extent, was intended to be established in the Thirty-Nine Articles." P. 93. The general object of Mr. O.'s publication, if I understand it, is to prove the Articles of our Church to be *Calvinistic*. This must be understood to mean, that they were constructed in conformity with the tenets of J. CALVIN. In page 85 of this section, Mr. O. told his readers, that the large portion of the great

body of the Clergy of our Church, who favoured Calvinistic sentiments, included the very men who thus formed and imposed these Articles." A few pages after (p. 91) Mr. O. writes thus: "On all hands, therefore, does it thus unquestionably appear, how generally those (Calvinistic) sentiments were entertained by the founders of our Church, which are now represented "as a curious conceit," "a system of nonsense, &c." The sentiments which in my writings were thus disgracefully characterized, related to the Calvinistic doctrine of *absolute and unconditional decrees*; which the learned JORTIN described, as "a religious system consisting of human creatures without liberty, doctrines without sense, faith without reason, and a God without mercy;" and which Dr. BALGUY somewhere calls "a system of nonsense," because it endeavours, in contradiction to the most decided language, to reconcile the *absolute decrees* of the DERRY with the accountability of a rational-being. Such, then, according to Mr. O.'s own statement, were the "sentiments entertained by the founders of our Church;" for to such sentiments alone did the observations of Drs. JORTIN and BALGUY apply; and the persons, according to Mr. O., who entertained these sentiments relative to absolute and unconditional decrees, were the "very men who framed and composed our Articles."

From which premises Mr. O.'s readers may be led to conclude, on his authority, that the Articles

of our Church were meant to be decidedly *Calvinistic*. But in the page now before us we are told by Mr. O. that "the precise theological system of J. CALVIN was not meant to be established in our Articles." This is such backward and forward writing, as renders the meaning of the writer to me incomprehensible. After having laboured through a whole Chapter for the express purpose of proving that our Reformers were decided Calvinists, and the Articles framed by them of course *Calvinistic*; Mr. O. turns short on his readers, and tells them, by way of conclusion to this same Chapter, that "the precise system of J. CALVIN was not intended to be established in the Articles." It would, therefore, I believe, be satisfactory to Mr. O.'s readers, and would certainly cut short the argument in this case, if Mr. O. would tell them, in plain unequivocal language, what system of doctrine was meant to be established in our Articles; without perplexing them with describing that doctrine under a title in itself *unscriptural*, and to which he himself does not annex any precise and determinate idea. Instead of saying then, as Mr. O. does, that "our established forms do not teach directly several doctrines contained in CALVIN's Institutions," p. 93; from which ambiguous mode of writing his readers may conclude, that our established forms teach those doctrines *indirectly*, and thus come prepared to swallow Calvinism in disguise; it would have been to better

purpose to have said plainly, what doctrines our established forms *directly do teach*. His readers then might have known, under what doctrines of our Church the tenets of Calvinism were supposed to be comprehended; and, if intelligent readers, have been qualified to judge of the strength of the ground, on which such a supposition stood.

Mr. O. proceeds, however, to inform his reader, that our Articles do not affirm the fall of Adam to be the effect of a Divine decree. But this is not saying that our Articles may not *indirectly* teach such a doctrine. And, indeed, according to the *Calvinistic* sense of predestination, by which it is understood, that the conduct and condition of every man has been determined by the eternal decree of God, I do not well see how such a doctrine is to be got rid of. Mr. O. proceeds. "They (our Articles) do not use the language which CALVIN's work does, respecting the extent of Christ's redemption. (They are silent concerning absolute reprobation," &c. As these characteristic doctrines of J. CALVIN, then, are confessedly not to be found in our Articles, the obvious conclusion from the literal and grammatical sense of our Articles is, that they were not meant to comprehend them. But when it is moreover considered, that doctrines, the very opposite to the heretical tenets of J. CALVIN, are to be found in our Articles, there can, it is presumed, be little doubt left on the mind of any intelligent reader,

that our Articles, instead of being merely silent on these points, were meant decidedly to exclude them.

“The authors, however, of these forms (Mr. O. proceeds to inform his reader) *unquestionably* built upon the same foundation with this celebrated reformer J. CALVIN, but they have not carried the superstructure to the same height.” P. 94.

If the truth of a position is to be determined by the confident language in which it is delivered, Mr. O.'s book must be considered to be one of the most decisive. In this as in many other parts of his publication, Mr. O. places the most questionable circumstance in the most commanding point of view; by assuring his readers, that our Reformers *unquestionably* built upon the same foundation with J. CALVIN, and that the only difference between them was, that one party carried his speculation on certain subjects further than the other. Now so far from this being *unquestionably* the state of this case, the *unquestionability* in this matter admits, if I mistake not, of a very different application.

The foundation on which J. CALVIN built his system, was, that the fall of ADAM was the consequence of the Divine decree; that redemption by CHRIST is *partial* and *unconditional*, in which none but certain individuals are interested; and that all who are not thus interested, are absolutely and unconditionally reprobated. This CALVIN considered to be the foundation of the covenant of grace in

CHRIST. Our Reformers rejected these doctrines, considering the redemption by CHRIST to be *universal*; and “that the promises of forgiveness of sins, and of adoption to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost, were visibly signed and sealed to *all* rightly admitted into the Church by baptism.”

Art. 27. “Our Reformers” (proceeds Mr. O.) “were aware of the extremes to which some had proceeded in these subjects, and the liability of the doctrines of grace to abuse; and wished, therefore, to express themselves with moderation and caution.”

P. 94. The doctrines of grace became liable to abuse in part, in consequence of the prevalence of the Calvinistic tenets: in laying down the doctrines of grace, therefore, it was an express object of our Reformers, not so much to speak with moderation and caution of the Calvinistic tenets, upon the idea that, taken in a *moderate* sense, they were to be received in our Church, as decidedly to exclude those tenets; considering them as constituting no part of that Evangelical doctrine which they meant to establish. “Our Reformers,” proceeds Mr. O., “were aware of the inability of the human understanding to comprehend the *whole* of the Divine plan of procedure towards his creatures; and, in course, of the difficulties attending the subject, when pursued beyond a certain limit.” P. 94. Our Reformers were certainly wise men. They shewed their wisdom, by presuming to know no more of God, than God

had thought proper to reveal. In treating, therefore, "of the Divine plan of procedure towards his creatures," they proceeded no further than the letter of revelation conducted them; their object being simply to lay down such doctrinal positions, as were calculated to ascertain the duties incumbent on the members of the Christian Church. "They wished, therefore," continues Mr. O., "in forming a standing public confession, to decide no further upon these deep points, than they believed the decision of importance, and for which they had the most express and certain warrant of scripture." Mr. O. could not have given a more true statement; and would what he has just said apply with equal truth to J. CALVIN, as it does to our Reformers, no controversy might have existed at this day on the present subject. But CALVIN proceeded upon a very different plan. Our Reformers suffered sacred scripture to speak for itself on the subject of predestination, without subjoining to it any particular definition of their own. J. CALVIN, thinking that scripture had not spoken sufficiently explicit on this subject, annexed to predestination his own particular interpretation. CALVIN saw, or at least thought he saw, further into the secret councils of the Deity than our Reformers presumed to do; and the event has proved to demonstration the comparative judgment of the respective parties. Whilst the members of our Church are taught by our Re-

formers to receive the promises of God as they are *generally* set forth in holy scripture, on the principle that God's secret councils, whatever they are, must be in conformity with his revealed will; because a God of truth cannot contradict himself: the disciples of J. CALVIN are taught to build their hope of salvation, not upon the plan of salvation that scripture has plainly revealed, but upon certain secret determinations of the Divine will, which are totally incompatible with, we may say, in decided contradiction to, it.

After having thus put the cloven foot out of sight, by smoothing down all the rough and deformed parts of the Calvinistic system, Mr. O. proceeds at length to give a sketch of the doctrine which our Reformers really meant to lay down. And had this been done before, it would have saved the trouble of writing at least the greatest part of this chapter. "They wished," says Mr. O., speaking of our Reformers, "*unequivocally* to teach, that man's salvation is wholly of grace, but his perdition is of himself; and neither to make God the author of sin, nor man a *mere machine*, and unfit to be treated as a *moral agent*. All beyond this they have left to be resolved on the principle of human ignorance."

This passage (it is probable) will prove to the reader, that Mr. O.'s manner of writing does not differ in one respect from that of most other Calvinists; who seldom write long on their favourite



subject, without more or less contradicting themselves. And this must be the case, so long as men of understanding will continue to defend a doctrine which, in itself, militates against the first principles of human reason.

Whether Mr. O. has a language peculiar to himself, with which it is necessary his reader should be acquainted previous to entering on his pages, or whether he makes use of words in a sense different from their general and received acceptation, it amounts to the same thing ; in either case his manner of writing must be unintelligible. To what Mr. O. here says of our Reformers, we cordially subscribe. But how, it must be asked, does it accord with what was said of them only a few pages back ? The doctrines they are here said *unequivocally* to teach, are the doctrines which the Church of England teaches. But her doctrines are decidedly *Anti-Calvinistic*. And if such are the doctrines Mr. O. *unequivocally* professes, he does himself discredit by calling himself a *Calvinist* ; for in such case he is no more a Calvinist than I am, or than the great body of the Clergy, I trust, actually are.

But though I am happy to join issue with Mr. O. in any page of his book, and am ready to attribute his contradiction of himself (as it appears to me) to any cause, but a want of the love of truth, still I am at a loss to account for the particular manner in which the present subject must strike Mr. O., to

justify the language made use of by him in the page before us.

The great object of the present chapter (as it has been above observed) is, to prove the *Calvinistic* sentiments of our Reformers, with a view of deducing from that circumstance the *true* interpretation of our Articles. These founders of our Church, only four pages back, were made chargeable with holding the extreme doctrines of Calvinism. For, in p. 91, Mr. O. tells his reader, that, “on all hands it unquestionably appears, that those sentiments which Drs. JORTIN and BALGUY, speaking of *absolute unconditional decrees*, represent to be “a system of nonsense,” and which “make God a tyrant,” were entertained by the founders of our Church. But in the page before us, the doctrines which they wished *unequivocally* to teach were these; that “man’s salvation is wholly of grace, but that his perdition is of himself; that God was not the author of sin, nor man a mere machine, but a *moral agent*.” And yet Mr. O. tells his reader, that this description of the doctrines meant to be established by the founders of our Church “is not in the smallest degree belying the principles he has ascribed to them, and mutilating the subject.” Whereas, on the supposition that Mr. O. makes use of words in their generally received acceptation, to me it unquestionably appears, that those very persons whom he described in p. 91 under the character of

decided Calvinists, in p. 95 he represents to be no Calvinists at all. Men, who, instead of having imbibed those unscriptural doctrines, which every intelligent reader of his Bible must, with Drs. JORTIN and BALGUY, unequivocally reprobate, manifested "the greatest piety and the greatest wisdom," "in framing a standing public confession," not by the imaginary standard of J. CALVIN, but "according to the most express and certain warrant of scripture."

Having brought his subject to this point, that is, after having been professedly engaged through a whole chapter in proving, in his way, the sentiments of our Reformers to be decidedly *Calvinistic*, and concluded with proving, in p. 95, that they were in no degree-*Calvinistic* at all; Mr. O. proceeds to christen the doctrines of the Church of England by the new invented title of "*moderate Calvinism*, which the Church of England now *unequivocally* inculcates." P. 95. "So far," says Mr. O., "she has *certainly decided*; the doctrines, now often termed *moderate Calvinism*, she unequivocally inculcates." "These (the doctrines of moderate Calvinism) corresponded with the doctrines of AUSTIN, the great model of her founders." What the doctrines of St. AUSTIN were, are well known; among them we find the following positions:—"That God had decreed not to impart his sufficient and saving grace to all men in general, but only to a select few, whom he had predestinated to salvation; that the

rest of mankind must, therefore, inevitably perish." This is plain language, and cannot but be understood. But how it is to be reconciled with the doctrines, for which Mr. O. has just given credit to our Reformers, is not to be understood. But what, it may be asked, have plain Christians to do with the writings of CALVIN or AUSTIN? The Bible is the standard of judgment by which all opinions must be tried; and to this Calvinists rarely appeal. Whereas the writings of AUSTIN or CALVIN have no authority but what they derive from the Bible, and are either admissible, or not, in proportion as they are conformable to it. CALVIN, we know, in some respects, misinterpreted the Bible;—and AUSTIN, in his zeal against Pelagianism, sometimes contradicted himself. When, therefore, Mr. O., instead of proving, as he should have done, the meaning of our Articles by our Liturgy, and their mutual correspondence with the language of the Bible, (a mode of proof, of which every plain Christian would be competent to form a judgment, and which puts Calvinism immediately out of fight) refers his reader, for the sense of our Church doctrines, to authorities which may never fall in his way; and if they did, and he was capable of understanding them, might tend only to perplex and confound him; we have but to remind Mr. O. of the principle laid down by our Church in her 6th Article to the following effect;—that "holy scripture containeth all things

necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." An Article which proves to demonstration what was the model adopted by our Reformers in framing their creed; with which idea the language of their first Homily strictly corresponds. "Therefore," say our Reformers, "forsaking the corrupt judgment of fleshly men, let us reverently hear and read holy scripture, which is the food of the soul; let us diligently search for the well of life in the books of the Old and New Testament, and not run to the stinking puddles of men's traditions (devised by men's imaginations) for our justification and salvation. For in holy scripture is fully contained what we ought to do, and what to eschew; what to believe; what to love; and what to look for at God's hand at length. We may learn, also, in these books, to know God's will and pleasure, as much as (for this present time) is convenient for us to know. And (as the great clerk and godly preacher St. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM saith) whatsoever is required to the salvation of man, is fully contained in scripture of God." And afterward, speaking of the hardness of some parts of sacred scripture, they go on to say, that to read it without danger of error, "it must be expounded no further than it can be plainly understood;" and "he that

is so weak that he is not able to bear strong meat, yet he may suck the sweet and tender milk, and defer the rest, until he wax stronger, and come to more knowledge. For God receiveth the learned and unlearned, and *casteth away none, but is indifferent to all.*" In conformity with this *general* language the Homily concludes: "By the means before pointed out," our Reformers say, "we shall enjoy the endless bliss and glory of Heaven, which He grant us all that *died for us all, &c.*"

I might here close my remarks on this Chapter; and leave the conclusion upon them to the reader; did not Mr. O.'s manner of winding it up call for some additional observations. The object Mr. O. professed to have in view was to ascertain the true interpretation of our Articles from the sentiments of our Reformers, and other corresponding circumstances. His reader's mind should, therefore, have been left as unbiassed as possible, in order that he might have been in a condition to form an unprejudiced judgment on the strength of the ground, on which Mr. O. takes his stand on this occasion. All personal references, consequently, which might leave an impression on the reader's mind unfavourable to his supposed opponents, should, according to the equity of argument, have been scrupulously avoided; from the conviction, that if the cause taken in hand be according to truth, it will stand by itself. Mr. O., indeed, has a right to say, that "when

certain writers have formed a frightful system of nothing but absolute *decrees*, absolute reprobation, and other extravagances, which we absolutely disavow, they may attack it as vehemently as they please: But it deserves their consideration, that it is a creature of their own, and that in respect to us, at least, the most pointed of their weapons falls *telum imbelles sine ictu*." P. 96. Mr. O. may certainly disavow this frightful system *ad libitum*; and in such case an attempt to fasten it upon him, as part of his creed, would be highly unjustifiable. But even in such case it deserves consideration, that this frightful system is not "the creature" of those writers of whom Mr. O. complains, but the creature of J. CALVIN, which those writers do no more than describe; and they describe it, not for the purpose of making Christian Ministers answerable for it, further than they expressly maintain it, but with the view of guarding Christians against it. Admitting, then, Mr. O. to be an absolute disavower of absolute decrees, he will be still liable to the imputation of being a supporter of them, whilst he maintains "the *fundamental* principles on which the Calvinistic system rests, to be incontrovertible." P. 355. If *absolute decrees* are not among the *fundamental* principles on which the Calvinistic system rests, I am yet to learn what is to be understood by that system.— "Mr. DAUBENY (Mr. O. proceeds to say) may deduce his consequences, assume the prerogative of

knowing men's hearts, and insist upon it, in spite of themselves, that they hold doctrines which they say and believe they do not; but it deserves his consideration, that such a procedure is absurd in itself, and contrary to the laws of controversy." P. 96.\*

The consequences at any time deduced by me from the frightful system under consideration are not, properly speaking, *my consequences*, but those

\* "To affirm (says another writer on the same ground) that every man must discern the consequences of every doctrine he maintains, is unreasonable;—to charge opponents with holding opinions which they expressly disavow, is a violation of the established rules of literary controversy."—*Academicus*, p. 17, 32. All this is most readily admitted. It is certainly inconsistent with reason to affirm that *every man must see*, what, upon a rational view of the subject, ought to be seen; because experience convinces us that all men do not possess, in an equal degree, the faculty of discernment. But whilst it is unreasonable to saddle men with consequences they do not discern, the circumstance of the acknowledged blindness of some men, as to the consequences of any important doctrine, renders the pointing them out to notice for general benefit a matter of still more imperious necessity. The point in question is, whether the consequences are generally connected with the doctrine under consideration or not. *Moderate* Calvinists, as they now call themselves, say, that the doctrine of *election* may stand without that of *reprobation*. Giving them credit for speaking what they think, we admit, that it would not be consistent with candour, or the established rules of controversy, to charge them with holding opinions, which they expressly disavow. At the same time it must be said, that if the doctrine of Calvinistic election does virtually comprehend under it that of reprobation, by whatever softer title it may be described; the circumstance of the necessary connection between these two parts of the same general doctrine not being clearly seen by *moderate* Calvinists, furnishes an argument only in favour of the exposition of that fallacy, by which they attempt to impose on themselves and others in their speculations on this important subject.



consequences which appear generally connected with the principles from which they are immediately derived. Such it is my duty to report, as the most effectual way of guarding against the principles from which they proceed. In giving up this point, I should transgress as much against truth, by neglecting to make the Calvinistic system responsible for its own general consequences; as I should against charity, by making the man chargeable with consequences which he professed not to maintain. "To assume, therefore, the prerogative of knowing men's hearts, and to insist upon it, in spite of themselves, that they hold doctrines which they say and believe they do not," is a procedure that cannot appear more absurd and uncharitable in Mr. O.'s eyes, than it does in my own. But I conceive Mr. O.'s heart has nothing to do with this business, but only his head. And if Mr. O. does commit himself to the public, as a maintainer of the "fundamental principles" on which the Calvinistic system rests, my reader will expect to know what those principles are. It is no pleasure to remark, from the general manner of Mr. O.'s conducting his subject, that he does not appear clearly to discriminate between the Calvinistic sense of predestination, and that Godly consideration of this subject, which, according to our Article, is calculated to minister hope and comfort to all sincere Christians. Nor does it tend to increase the weight of Mr. O.'s judgment in our scale of estimation, to

observe him deprecating that conduct in one page, which he himself adopts without scruple or qualification in the next. "To assume the prerogative of knowing men's hearts," Mr. O. told his reader in p. 96, "is absurd in itself and contrary to the established rules of controversy." And yet in the very following page Mr. O., speaking of his supposed opponents, thus places them in a contrasted point of view with sincere Christians: "Many sincere Christians, we believe, are prepared to join in the songs of Heaven, in ascribing their whole "salvation to God and the Lamb," and hold the above doctrines *essentially*, who disown the *name* we have affixed to them. With these persons we would by no means quarrel for the sake of a *term*, which we only adopt in the want of one to express our sentiments more perfectly. But what is of more weight in the consideration, it is not either the name or the nature of Calvinism, as such, to which our opponents confine their attack; it is "*the doctrine of salvation by grace, through faith in the Redeemer*, under whatever form or name it is professed, to which, in reality, they at the bottom object." P. 97.

Thank God, this is not my language. Would, that it was not the language of Mr. OVERTON. All I say in answer to it is this: That when Mr. O. shall have considered, that "*the doctrine of salvation by grace, through faith in the Redeemer*," constituted the ~~fundamental~~ doctrine of the primitive

Church; that St. AUSTIN's *new system* was not known during the four first centuries of the Christian æra; and that Calvinism is but AUSTIN's system carried to a still greater extreme; he will perhaps see no inconsistency in Christian divines *unequivocally* reprobating the unscriptural tenets of J. CALVIN, at the same time that they may be as zealous advocates for the *Evangelical* doctrines of grace, through faith in the Redeemer, as Mr. O. himself.

Mr. O.'s conclusion from this Chapter is drawn up in the following words:—"Whether, therefore, the Church of England has determined this way, or the other, or neither, on some of the abstruse points agitated between the Calvinists and Arminians, is not our determining point. On this circumstance we do not found the truth of our main position. But *thus much* we must insist upon; *this* every person, sufficiently acquainted with these subjects, will see it impossible not to allow us; that in proportion as *Calvinism prevailed when our Articles were established, and as the private sentiments of the compilers, revisers, and imposers of these Articles were Calvinistic*, a strong argument is furnished in favour of our interpretation of them, and in opposition to theirs, whose ingenuity is employed in explaining them away." P. 97.

The reader, it is probable, from the manner in which Mr. O. has handled his cause in the foregoing part of this Chapter, may think that the decision of

the Church of England was meant to be set up as the standard by which the point in question was to be determined. But if the Church of England has determined nothing on the subjects under dispute, the private opinion of her members can be considered as having no more weight in determining that dispute at one time than at another. What Mr. O. insists on in this case, shall be most readily admitted; that “in proportion as *Calvinism* prevailed when our Articles were established, and as the private sentiments of the compilers, &c. were *Calvinistic*, a strong argument is furnished in favour of Mr. O.’s interpretation” of those Articles. But before this argument can be strong enough to stand upon its legs, it must be proved, that what Mr. O. here represents as *a given point*, was really the fact. We deny *in toto*, that either Calvinism did prevail, or that the sentiments of our Reformers were Calvinistic, when the Articles were compiled; and the evidence by which these points are to be established, is such as no Calvinist will be ever able to set aside. To determine the points, which Mr. O. here begs, in his favour, the experiment must be fairly made upon the original compilers in EDWARD’S reign. This Mr. O. has not done. And on the supposition that the point relative to the Calvinistic sentiments of our original Reformers should be proved, such proof can furnish at best but *presumptive* evidence, in favour of the interpretation intended to be maintained by it.

to be drawn from which circumstance evidently is; that the private sentiments of the composers of that system must be *Calvinistic*. Should Mr. O. write an History of England, he would tell the same story. Should an Anti-Calvinist write one, this subject would be differently stated. Such contradictory evidence to an uninformed reader must prove just nothing; it could be considered by him in no other light, than as the *ipse dixit* opinion of writers of different persuasions; that it was, in fact, saying what *they thought* of our Reformers, not what those Reformers thought *for themselves*, which was what Mr. O. proposed to lay before his readers. It does not seem necessary, therefore, that we should here stop to enquire into the sentiments of these different historians, on the subject under consideration; since their testimony, if admitted, (which is by no means the case) would not furnish the proof requisite on this occasion. The evidence brought from the writings of our Reformers to prove their *private sentiments*, the only proper evidence by which those sentiments were to be ascertained, is very partial. On this ground the reader has observed Mr. O. scarce venturing to enter. From the writings of CRANMER, RIDLEY, and LATIMER, authentic documents which would have spoken decidedly for their respective authors, not a single extract has been made; and from HOOPER one only has been brought forward, and that not the most *unequivocal* that might have been found.

From this partial and imperfect manner of handling his subject, then, according to which (so far as I have been capable of judging, and I wish to judge fairly) the author sets out with professing to do what he never attempts, and proceeds to maintain what he never proves; Mr. O., in conformity with his usual stile of writing, draws his *unquestionable conclusions*.

With respect to the first of these conclusions, which maintains that our Reformers meant to establish *all they have expressed*, there can be no dispute. The second which follows upon it must be equally admitted, namely, "That all who in any degree *extenuate* or *evade* the plain, literal, and full meaning of the Articles, do not teach them as they were first delivered by our Reformers." But to the charge subjoined in the following unequivocal language,—  
 "this, in a very notorious degree, it has appeared in a former Chapter, is undeniably the conduct of our opponents;"—I, as an individual, most decidedly object; and my appeal is to the intelligent reader. On the subject of the plain, literal, and grammatical sense of our Articles, there seems to be no difference of opinion between Mr. O. and myself. But though we meet in our premises, we separate in our conclusion. Mr. O. maintains the full, literal, and grammatical sense of the Articles, and reprobates all evasion; because he considers the *Calvinistic* interpretation to be thereby effectually secured. I subscribe to the full, literal, and grammatical sense, for

the very opposite reason; because, according to the intent of the Declaration prefixed, (as it has been already proved) the Calvinistic interpretation, *Calvinists themselves being judges*, is thereby effectually *excluded*. Thus are we arrived at length at the end of this Chapter; to which, on account of its containing the strength of Mr. O.'s cause, particular attention has been paid; by analyzing, in a degree, the materials of which it is composed. This done, and I trust fairly, I refrain from delivering a verdict on the case; it being my wish, as far as may be, to leave the scale of judgment in the hand of my reader.

*“Quod verum curo et rogo.”*

### CHAPTER III.

*An Examination whose Teaching most resembles that of our Church and her Reformers, in respect to the Use made of the peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel, and the Necessity of practical Christianity.*

THE subject which Mr. O. has brought before his readers, begins here to contract itself. From the general examination of the Calvinistic doctrines, considered as the doctrines intended to be established by our religious system, Mr. O. now proceeds to the comparative examination of the *teaching* of those individuals, who are supposed to differ in opinion from the Ministers, whose cause he advocates. Here then, at least, the subject before us begins to be *personal*. And however, in the original design and opening of his publication, Mr. O. might consider himself as only vindicating the *true Churchmanship* of Ministers, whose characters, in his opinion, had been unjustly aspersed, and defending the genuine doctrines of our Church; yet, from the commencement of this Chapter, he must be considered, by others, as having changed his ground,



and assumed a character foreign to the title under which he had chosen to appear before the world. Mr. O.'s publication was ushered in with a formal complaint against "*aggressors, who have attacked personally, and by name, a number of individuals, who had taken no such liberty with them.*" Preface, p. 4. And the subject of their charge is represented to be of such a nature, "as affects at once their understanding, their integrity, their reputation, and their interest." For these individuals Mr. O. comes forward in the character of *apologist*. This character, by determining the nature of Mr. O.'s publication, teaches his readers what they were to expect from it. And, had Mr. O. confined himself to this, his readers, judging from the apology that he made, in what the supposed charge consisted, and how far it had or had not been substantiated, might have been qualified to draw their conclusion with respect to the merits of the case. Here Mr. O.'s publication, in conformity with its title, ought to have terminated.

But the object Mr. O. had in view on this occasion, appears to have been, not so much to apologize for a supposed condemned party, as to criminate their accusers, the reputed aggressors, whom he describes as "*the real offenders.*"

But admitting Mr. O.'s representation of the unjust treatment experienced by his Ministers to be correct, it will hardly be thought, that he has adopted

the most judicious method of establishing the rectitude of the cause he has undertaken. If the Calvinistic sense of our Articles be the sense of the Church of England, and of truth, it will stand firm on the ground of fair argument and authentic fact; and it is to disgrace the cause, to attempt to keep it upright, by the exposition of the false doctrines of divines of a different persuasion. For this purpose, however, Mr. O. exchanges the character of apologist for that (the last which an humble Christian would wish to assume) of censor and judge. In what manner he has conducted himself in this difficult and responsible character, it must be for my readers to determine.

That I should enter further into this part of Mr. O.'s publication, than as it bears on myself, is not to be expected. Those writers with whom Mr. O. has thought proper to class me in his title-page, even were I better qualified for the task, would not thank me for undertaking their defence. It is probable, they might form a better opinion of my judgment, had I suffered such an attack on my own writings and professional character to have passed unnoticed.

But desirous as I am, through grace, to serve the Church in any way, though the subject necessarily turns so much upon myself, some satisfaction must, I trust, be derived from my pages to all unprejudiced, candid, and discriminating readers; and for such only I profess to write,

Mr. O. thus opens the present Chapter :—" It is a ~~fact~~, of which it is impossible to doubt, that our Reformers did not teach the doctrines in question, as mere speculative and uninteresting opinions, which it is sufficient barely to assent to, and contemplate at a distance ; but as truths of the very highest importance, truths which it becomes every Christian to know *practically*." P. 100. No man of common sense can, in these days, be so ignorant of the nature of the Christian religion, as seriously to entertain the contrary supposition ; as not to know that speculative religion can be valuable only as it terminates in practice ; and that a " God, being a Spirit, to be worshipped *acceptably*, must be worshipped in spirit and in truth." To inform his readers, therefore, that " our Reformers held the absolute necessity of something more than a *mere form* of religion," was to furnish him with no information, of which, it is to be hoped, he was not already in possession.

But Mr. O.'s object appears to be, not so much to acquaint his readers with the sentiments of our Reformers, as to contrast the conduct of those divine men, who never " forgot the peculiar doctrines of the gospel in their public discourses," with that of those Ministers on whom Mr. O. is preparing to animadvert ; who are indirectly pointed out, in p. 101, as " considering it to be their chief business, to be the apes of EPICTETUS, PLATO, or SENECA."

With this view he thus proceeds :—" Either, then, the Church of England considers *all* persons real

Christians who are comprehended within her external pale, or she considers only *some* of her visible members entitled to this character, and the rest mere nominal and professed Christians. In a general form she uses general expressions. She assumes not the prerogative of knowing either men's hearts, or God's unrevealed appointments. Necessarily, therefore, not less than in the judgment of charity, on some occasions, she addresses *all* as true Christians, who *profess* to be such. Every child that she has baptized, she speaks of as "regenerate," as a partaker of the privileges of the Gospel, and as, in some sense, called to "a state of salvation." She puts the language of real Christians into the mouths of all her worshippers. She expresses a favourable hope of every one she inters. Are we, then, hence to conclude, that our Church knows of no distinction, but that between professed Christians and professed Heathens, Jews, &c.; and that she really considers *all* who are her nominal members, in such a sense, in a state of salvation, as that they will escape future punishment, and obtain everlasting happiness, *whatever be their characters?*" P. 102.

To whom, it may be asked, is this language addressed? Had Mr. O. but allowed himself to consider, that the divines, upon whom he sits in judgment, might be men of equal understanding with himself, he would never have hazarded so weak a question. And when Mr. O. has proved, that an opinion so

to be drawn from which circumstance evidently is; that the private sentiments of the composers of that system must be *Calvinistic*. Should Mr. O. write an History of England, he would tell the same story. Should an Anti-Calvinist write one, this subject would be differently stated. Such contradictory evidence to an uninformed reader must prove just nothing; it could be considered by him in no other light, than as the *ipse dixit* opinion of writers of different persuasions; that it was, in fact, saying what *they thought* of our Reformers, not what those Reformers thought *for themselves*, which was what Mr. O. proposed to lay before his readers. It does not seem necessary, therefore, that we should here stop to enquire into the sentiments of these different historians, on the subject under consideration; since their testimony, if admitted, (which is by no means the case) would not furnish the proof requisite on this occasion. The evidence brought from the writings of our Reformers to prove their *private sentiments*, the only proper evidence by which those sentiments were to be ascertained, is very partial. On this ground the reader has observed Mr. O. scarce venturing to enter. From the writings of CRANMER, RIDLEY, and LATIMER, authentic documents which would have spoken decidedly for their respective authors, not a single extract has been made; and from HOOPER one only has been brought forward, and that not the most *unequivocal* that might have been found.

From this partial and imperfect manner of handling his subject, then, according to which (so far as I have been capable of judging, and I wish to judge fairly) the author sets out with professing to do what he never attempts, and proceeds to maintain what he never proves; Mr. O., in conformity with his usual stile of writing, draws his *unquestionable conclusions*.

With respect to the first of these conclusions, which maintains that our Reformers meant to establish *all they have expressed*, there can be no dispute. The second which follows upon it must be equally admitted, namely, "That all who in any degree *extenuate* or *evade* the plain, literal, and full meaning of the Articles, do not teach them as they were first delivered by our Reformers." But to the charge subjoined in the following unequivocal language,—  
 "this, in a very notorious degree, it has appeared in a former Chapter, is undeniably the conduct of our opponents;"—I, as an individual, most decidedly object; and my appeal is to the intelligent reader. On the subject of the plain, literal, and grammatical sense of our Articles, there seems to be no difference of opinion between Mr. O. and myself. But though we meet in our premises, we separate in our conclusion. Mr. O. maintains the full, literal, and grammatical sense of the Articles, and reprobates all evasion; because he considers the *Calvinistic* interpretation to be thereby effectually secured. I subscribe to the full, literal, and grammatical sense, for

Holy Spirit from the state of nature in which he was born, and to which a curse belongs, to that state of grace and mercy in CHRIST, which gives him, as the child of God by adoption, a covenanted title to an heavenly inheritance. A benefit which, St. AUSTIN says, is not to be lost but by the subsequent impiety of the party concerned. “*Semet perceptam parvulus gratiam non amittit, nisi propria impietate, si aetatis accessu tam malus evaserit.*” \*

“ Infomuch (say our Reformers in the Homily on Salvation) that infants being baptized, and dying in their infancy, are by his sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God’s favour, and made his children, and inheritors of his kingdom of heaven.”

∴ This important sense of baptism I think necessary to be insisted on, for reasons that may hereafter appear. At the same time our Church reminds us, that “ baptism represents unto us our profession, which is, to follow the example of CHRIST, and to be made like unto him.” With this view she prays, that the “ child may lead the rest of his life according to this (spiritual) beginning,” by dying, indeed, unto sin, and living unto righteousness; to the end that he may “ finally be an inheritor of CHRIST’s everlasting kingdom.” Thus, then, should the child die in infancy, he is saved in consequence of his spiritual regeneration by baptism. Should he live to years of responsibility, when he has (in the language

\* Augustin ad Bonifac. Ep. 98. p. 264, tom. ii.

of St. AUSTIN) “*propria peccata*, his own proper sins to answer for,” the ultimate effect of his baptism will depend upon his spiritual condition at the time of his being taken out of the world. In reference, therefore, to the benefit derived from baptism to him, *considered in that state*, it is certainly the judgment of our Church, that “he is not a Christian who is one outwardly, but he is a Christian who is one inwardly; and baptism (in such case) is that in the spirit, not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God.” Whilst baptism, considered abstractedly, as the sacrament of spiritual regeneration, by which the party, being translated from his natural state in ADAM to a spiritual state in CHRIST, becomes invested with a covenant claim to Gospel privileges, is the same in all cases: because, as it is God that regenerates, the form appointed by Him for that purpose must be productive of its intended effect. On this head it must be unnecessary to enlarge. And when it is considered that “the divines against whom Mr. O. is bringing his charge, are divines of the Church of England, who necessarily must administer the service that teaches the above doctrine, to insinuate (as Mr. O. does in p. 102) that these divines give the members of the Church to understand, that, in consequence of their admission into the Church by baptism, they are sure of “obtaining eternal happiness, *whatever be their characters*,” is not to give them credit for possessing either common sense or principle.



Mr. O. having thus prepared his intended charge against his brethren, in p. 107 commences his application of it to the arraigned party. "And now, (says Mr. O.) whatever all this accords with besides, it is notoriously the doctrine of those for whom we are apologizing; and this necessity of a personal practical acquaintance with the doctrines of the SAVIOUR, and this consequent distinction between real and nominal Christians, constitutes, in the judgment of such divines as Dr. PALEY, Dr. CROFT, Mr. DAUBENY, &c. the very essence of their guilt."

"The system of the *one* makes something real and internal, a certain state of heart and character essential to real Christianity; the *other*, as will appear presently, treats all as *real* Christians who assume the Christian name, and comply with the external forms of religion."

Had Mr. O. contented himself with characterizing the mode of teaching made use of by those Ministers for whom he professes to apologize, I should not have thought myself justified in contradicting him, because I know them not. But when Mr. O. proceeds from the defence of one party to the unqualified crimination of another, the aspect his publication then assumes, tempts me to recommend earnestly to his perusal the writings of the pious and truly charitable Bishop HALL. His treatise on Christian moderation, if duly meditated on, might, perhaps, prevent Mr. O. from suffering his book to pass into another edition, till it had undergone numerous and essential

alterations. For in that excellent treatise he would find the following observations, which could not fail to leave some impression on the mind of a Christian minister. "At a contentious bar, where wrangling fomenters of quarrels are wont to aggravate all advantages, this liberty (I know not how justly) hath been given, that they commonly frame large bills of complaint, and suggest wrongs that were never done; but for divines in the cause of God, who pretend to plead for truth before God and his Angels, to be thus lavish in their criminations, it is a high violation of Christian charity and justice. Now, God forbid," continues the pious Bishop, "that either Church or man should be tried by his adversary. This were no other than that the arraigned innocent should be sentenced by the executioner. And if in a civil judicature there be required sworn and able judges, just laws, clear evidence, select jurors, recorded proceedings; how much more ought this to be expected in those pleas of religion, which concern the eternal state of the soul, the safety of the Church, and the glory of our Creator and Redeemer." *Hall's Works*, vol. iii. p. 41. As Mr. O. has not, in this page, referred to any part of my writings, by which the charge here brought against me, in common with other divines, is to be substantiated, the reader, for the present at least, will consider it to be a mere *gratis dictum*; and bearing in mind the observation of the bishop just appealed to, "that to

a man of peace nothing is more requisite than a charitable distrust; he will not take an adversary's word for the state of his opposite." Indeed, gross and improbable as the charge is, till "clear evidence and recorded proceedings" shall be brought to support it, it will be considered a loss of time to put in a serious answer to it. I therefore pass on to p. 112, in which Mr. O. begins to bring his charge more close.

"But let us examine (said he) how the teaching of our opponents agrees with that of the Church of England, on the subjects under consideration." And that his readers may be at no loss for an estimate by which that examination is to be conducted, Mr. O. brings before him quotations from Mr. JONES, Bishops HORNE, HORSELEY, and the Bishop of DURHAM, to prove that the lamentable cause of the present deplorable state of religion is to be chiefly traced up to that stile of preaching, of which his opponents stand chargeable. Mr. O. should know, that the truth and usefulness of all general positions depend in a great measure upon the judgment employed in their particular application. The respectable writers above-mentioned, in the passages brought before the reader, meant to establish a position, which all intelligent Ministers of the Church of England, I trust, readily admit; although there undoubtedly have been and may be instances of sufficient attention not being paid to it. The truth of

this position, that to inculcate *heathen morality* is not to preach *Christianity*, is in itself incontrovertible; but to justify Mr. O.'s application of it on this occasion, it was incumbent upon him to have first clearly evinced, that the divines against whom his charge is brought, are truly those "apes of EPICTELUS, PLATO, and SENECA," which these respectable writers had in view, and against whom their complaint was directed.

My reader will observe that I refrain from disproving any thing, till the whole of Mr. O.'s bill has been delivered in. I proceed, therefore, to p. 115, in which, after many ventrous preludes, Mr. O. at length begins to substantiate his charge:—"But let us see (says Mr. O.) how the teachers in question speak, with respect to the necessity of internal and practical Christianity, in order to salvation. The Anti-Jacobin Reviewers then, in opposition to those who contend for this kind of religion, say, "our Church supposes *all* who are baptized to be in a state of salvation." Hence the reader is led to conclude from Mr. O., that the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers are in opposition to those who contend for internal and practical Christianity. To prove this bold position Mr. O. argues thus: "Now if this phrase has any meaning, as it is here used, it must mean *all whatever be their characters*." Though such may be the meaning of the phrase in question, according to Mr. O.'s standard of judgment, yet I will venture to say,

no unprejudiced reader, who gives the Editors of the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers credit for common sense, will conclude that such was intended to be its meaning. Mr. O. himself, it might be supposed, could scarcely have thought the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers weak enough to entertain such an idea; nor does it properly belong to the meaning of the phrase in question. To *suppose* a thing to be, and to *affirm* it to be, are two very different modes of speech; convey very different senses, and denote a very different state of mind in the party. To *suppose*, is to take a thing for granted without proof, and is more the result of hope than of assurance; to *affirm* a thing to be, is to speak from the knowledge of fact. Our Church, from the consideration that Baptism, duly administered, places her members in a state of salvation, *supposes* all baptized persons to be in a state of salvation; because she *supposes* at the same time, that all circumstances relative to those persons are in conformity with that state. Such being her hope for all her members, she charitably *supposes* that such is, because such *ought to be*, their condition.

Mr. O., speaking of the Church of England in page 102, appears to have said the same thing, "The Church of England (says he) assumes no prerogative of knowing either men's hearts, or God's unrevealed appointments. Necessarily, therefore, not less than in the judgment of charity, she addresses *all* as true Christians, who *profess* to be

such. Every child that she has baptized, she speaks of as *regenerate*, as a partaker of the privileges of the Gospel, and as, in some sense, called to a state of salvation. She expresses a favourable hope of every one she inters." Is, then, the Church of England by this charitable supposition, by which she takes things for granted without proof, and hopes in cases where charity forbids her to condemn, to be considered as acting in opposition to those who contend for *internal and practical Christianity*? If not, why, it may be asked, are the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers made chargeable with such opposition, for merely reporting of the Church of England, what Mr. O. himself acknowledges to be the real state of the case? And why may not the Editors of the Anti-Jacobin Review, in the phrase under consideration, be understood in the same *qualified* sense, in which Mr. O. would wish to be understood in the use of phrases of a similar import? "All professing Christians (Mr. O. admits, p. 115) are so far in a state of salvation, as to enjoy Church privileges, and the means of salvation." But Mr. O. will not admit all *professing* Christians to be *true* Christians. The Church of England *supposes* them to be such; for, as Mr. O. observes, "she addresses all as true Christians, who *profess* to be such." A reader, with Mr. O.'s turn of mind, might here say with as much shew of reason as he has said to the Editors of the Anti-Jacobin Review, that the Church of England opposes

all internal and practical Christianity," for, in her estimation, profession and practice are the same thing; since she *supposes* all to be *true* Christians, who *profess* to be such.

But when the meaning intended to be conveyed is fairly to be understood, to cavil at words is only to trifle with the reader: and it will be concluded by every discriminating person, that there can be no great strength in a cause, the advocate for which is obliged first to make his supposed opponents talk nonsense, in order that he may find something to advance against them. By every plain man who is not on the hunt for objections, the position of the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers, and that of Mr. O. respecting our Church, will be equally taken, as they were meant, not in a *positive* but *presumptive* sense; and he will no more conclude, because the Church addresses *all* as *true* Christians who *profess* to be such, that therefore she means to say, that there is no difference between *true* Christians and *nominal* professors; than he will conclude from the position advanced by the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers, namely, "that the Church *supposes* *all* who are baptized to be in a state of salvation," that the meaning intended to be conveyed by them was, that all baptized persons will be saved, be their life what it may. To what Mr. O. says, therefore, by way of prelude to his remark on this occasion, "let us now see (says he) how the teachers in question, speak with respect

to the necessity of internal and practical Christianity; the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers may answer, that it was not their intention to say any thing one way or the other on that subject; nor do they conceive that the conclusion for which they are here made responsible, has any necessary connection with the position under consideration. The charge here brought against the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers has been taken on myself, because the position in question having been advanced, in consequence of their review of my publications, I have considered myself bound, in honour, to reply to it. "I now proceed to the consideration of an attack directed immediately against myself.

"Mr. DAUBENY in the like manner (says Mr. O., p. 115) sees no difference between the *true* Church of Christ and the *national* Church; represents professed membership with this *national* society, as forming the line of distinction between the world, which lieth in wickedness and a state of condemnation before God, and those who are in a state of sanctification and salvation; and speaks indiscriminately of all who have been regularly baptized, and remain in the established communion, as "members of Christ's spirit," "the peculiar property of Christ," as "having a peculiar interest in him;" in other words, as "translated from the world," "delivered from the powers of darkness," and "heirs with Christ of an eternal kingdom." The sense in which the several foregoing phrases are to be received in



the pages from which they are taken, no intelligent reader can be at any loss to determine; and should he be properly acquainted with the nature of the Christian Church, he will see no reason to object to them. According, however, to the conclusion to which Mr. O.'s statement is here meant to lead, the author of them is supposed to be writing in opposition to those who contend for the necessity of internal and practical Christianity; and lest the reader should not readily concur in such improbable conclusion, Mr. O. proceeds to strengthen his ground by adding that "every Christian," that is, every professed Christian, he says again, after being called to reconsider the subject, who "is living in a state of communion with the Church," namely, with that "visible society" of Christians, where the Episcopal form of Government is to be found, "*is in the sure road to salvation*:"—Yet, surely, concludes Mr. O., the sin of schism may be heinous, the ministrations of self-constituted teachers presumptuous and inefficacious, and the advantages of a conscientious adherence to our established Church inestimable, and this consequence not follow." P. 116. What consequence? it may be asked. The consequence Mr. O. himself draws from Mr. DAUBENY's premises; or the consequence to which those premises fairly lead? According to Mr. O.'s statement, his readers are to understand it to be Mr. D.'s opinion, that every person conforming to our *national*

Church, is, by virtue of that conformity, sure of being saved. The question is, does the language made use of by Mr. D. warrant such a conclusion? To determine this, the reader must take the trouble to examine the several parts of my publication, marked down in the margin of Mr. O.'s page. The result of that examination, if I mistake not, will be a decided conviction, that Mr. O. has grossly misrepresented the meaning of the author. Mr. O. sets out with saying, that "Mr. D. sees no difference between the *true* Church of CHRIST and the *national* Church, &c." Mr. D., in the parts of his writings here referred to, says no such thing. According to Mr. O.'s mode of quoting, indeed, that is, by tacking together three or four words from one page of a book, and three or four from another, without regard to subject or context, he may make an author speak just what he pleases. But though Mr. O. may contrive to weave these several scraps together into a sentence of his own, yet his readers will suffer themselves to be egregiously deceived, if they take their opinion of the sentiments of the original author from such a mutilated transcript from his writings. Mr. O., on the supposition that he has read for himself, must know, that in none of the passages referred to at the bottom of his page the *national* Church is once mentioned; nor has the subject, to which those passages belong, any reference to the Church, as a *national* establishment.

By the introduction of the word *national*, the passages in question are more suited to Mr. O.'s comment; but then the language is not that of their author. In the 15th and 16th pages of the "Guide," for instance, I am preparing my readers for the general subject of my book. The discourse, of which these pages constitute a part, has for its title; "on the nature, design, and constitution of the *Christian* Church," not the *national* Church; consequently what follows in the Chapter must be expected to correspond with that title. In page 15 I therefore write thus:—"To understand the nature and design of the *Christian* Church, we must consider the world at large as lying in wickedness, and consequently in a state of condemnation before God. Out of this wicked society, of which all men are by nature born members, God has been pleased to call men into another society, very different from it; the object of which is to minister to their salvation, by so purifying them from the corruption of a fallen world, that they may not be condemned with it. This society, sometimes called the *Church of CHRIST*, because CHRIST purchased it with his blood; sometimes *his kingdom*, because He is the King and Governor of it; was set up in opposition to that kingdom of the world which has Satan for its prince. Into this society or kingdom persons are admitted by baptism, which is the seal of conveying to them an assurance of their future inheritance; by the re-

gular application of which, they are sanctified or set apart from the rest of the world, as the peculiar property of the Holy Spirit. Having then, in consequence of their being born anew of the Holy Spirit in baptism, professedly drawn themselves from the service of the prince of this world, and entered into that of the living God; they become entitled to those privileges, which the King into whose service they are entered, has purchased for his subjects." In pages 171 and 172, I am also describing the same *Christian* Church in its general character, design, and properties. Speaking of CHRIST, in allusion to the title given to him by the Apostle, Eph. v. 23, as "the saviour of the body," I say, "we no where read of him in the character of a Saviour, but with reference to that Church, which he is said to have purchased with his blood. In consequence of this purchase, the Church is considered to be the peculiar property of Christ; every member of it, therefore, must have a peculiar interest in him. The Church, then, according to the idea which the Scripture has taught us to form of it, is that spiritual association, which draws, as it were, the line of distinction between those who are living without God, and consequently without hope, and those who are formally admitted into covenant with Him, and sealed with "the holy spirit of promise, as an earnest of their future inheritance." In the above passages, to which Mr. O. refers on this occasion, for the purpose of

substantiating his charge against me of opposing those who "contend for internal and practical Christianity," my readers must see, that the object I had in view, was simply to describe the Christian Church in its general character, design, and properties, without reference to any *national* establishment of it whatever, or to the particular condition of its individual members; neither of those subjects being then under consideration. In fact I was giving a definition of the Church, as a spiritual society of CHRIST's forming, in its distinction from the world lying in wickedness, similar to that given by the late Mr. JONES, in his celebrated Essay on the Church; for the propriety of which, appeal may be made to the authority of St. PAUL. The Apostle puts his converts at Ephesus in mind, that they were, in time past, "Gentiles in the flesh, without Christ, having no hope, and without God in the world. But that now in Christ JESUS, they who were sometime afar off, were made nigh by the blood of Christ." In consequence of which admission into the Church of CHRIST, he says, "they were no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God." Eph. ii. The Apostle is here evidently contrasting the past condition of his Ephesian converts, when in a state of *heathenism*, with their present one under the gospel; with this view, after alluding to their former dark and hopeless state, he describes to them, in strong language,

the privileges annexed to their change of condition: That by their admission into the Church, they had gained an interest in CHRIST, a title to premises to which before they had no claim; and from being strangers to GOD, were now become part of his household, and fellow-citizens with the Saints. Now did St. PAUL, by thus describing the privileges annexed to Church membership, intend to discourage internal and practical Christianity; by giving his disciples at Ephesus to understand, that in consequence of their being delivered from the darkness of their Gentile state, and made members of CHRIST's body, the Church, having thereby gained an interest in CHRIST, and become fellow-citizens with the Saints, that therefore they were sure to be finally partakers with the Saints in glory, let them live how they would? Mr. O. must know, that no such consequence can follow from these expressions; because the Apostle expressly gives the same Ephesians, whom he calls "fellow-citizens with the Saints," in the first part of his epistle, to understand, by the directions delivered to them in the latter part of it, that their being made *finally* partakers with the Saints, would depend on their walking worthy of the privileges to which they had been graciously admitted. "I therefore beseech you, (says the Apostle) that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye have been called; that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk; that ye put off con-

cerning the old man, which is corrupt, and being renewed in the spirit of the mind, that ye put on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness." The Apostle then subjoins a variety of directions, for the regulation of the religious and moral conduct of *these fellow-citizens with the Saints*, as he had before called them, in reference to their baptismal privileges; reminding them, that "no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of CHRIST and of GOD." And in this same strain of serious charge, with a view to the security of their eternal state, does the Apostle proceed to the conclusion of his epistle. If, then, no such consequence as Mr. O. here points out, can follow from St. PAUL's description of the privileges, which have been graciously annexed to an admission into the Christian Church, generally considered; why should such consequence be made to follow from a similar description by any other Christian minister? It surely requires no great strength of understanding to distinguish between the privileges annexed to Church membership in general, and the benefit ultimately derived from it to the party in particular; and no great portion of charity, to conclude, that no intelligent divine could consider the one to be the *necessary* consequence of the other.

But with the view of confirming the absurd and improbable charge here alluded to, Mr. O. brings

forward another passage from the 452d page of the "Appendix to the Guide," which, without regard either to subject or context, is made to speak the following language.—"Every Christian, (that is every *professed* Christian, he says again, after being called upon to reconsider the subject) "who is living in a state of communion with the Church, namely, with that visible society of Christians where the Episcopal form of government is to be found, is in the sure road to salvation." My readers, by turning to the page here referred to, will have a specimen of Mr. O.'s mode of quoting, as well as of the legitimacy of his conclusions. My object in the page under consideration was clearly that of guarding against the substitution of the *invisible* for the *visible* Church; by which many well-meaning Christians are led to seek after that which is *invisible*, and which, as such, can be known to God only; at the same time that they turn their backs upon, and live in contempt of, that *visible* Church which God has placed before their eyes. With this view, I say, that to call men to become members of an *invisible* society, seems to be, if not a contradiction, yet an absurdity in terms. The characteristic mark which distinguishes any society, is its *appropriate government*. The appropriate government of the visible Church is that Episcopal form, which was originally established by the Apostles. Where that form of government is to be found, there the Church of



Christ, as a *visible society*, exists. From whence it follows, that every Christian must know, if he will but consider, whether he is living in a state of communion with the Church, or in a state of separation from it. If in the former condition, he is in the sure road to salvation, "for he is faithful who hath promised;" the consequence of his being in the latter it is not our business to determine; in this case, "as we know only in part, we therefore prophesy only in part." Had Mr. O., when this passage was before him, but considered the nature of that promise, which the Faithful One makes to the children of fallen Adam, when admitted into covenant with him by baptism, the meaning which properly belongs to the phrase of a *member of Christ's Church being in the sure road to salvation*, could not possibly have escaped him.

My readers will now judge, how far the passage under consideration warrants the conclusion that has been drawn from it. They will see, in fact, that it was not intended to have any relation to the subject to which Mr. O. has applied it; that it was meant only to point out the general advantage of communion with the Church, in opposition to the danger, or at least uncertainty, attendant on separation from it; but to determine nothing relative to the condition of individual members of that Church.

But it must be clearly seen, what it is hoped Mr. O. will admit, that to say, that in the Church there is certainty of salvation, is not to say, that every

member of the Church will surely be saved; Mr. O. chooses to understand me in that sense. But with that evidence in my hand, which expressly informs me, that Christ established his Church on earth, for the purpose of "purifying to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works," I must want common understanding to suppose, that it can be a matter of no consequence, whether the members of that Church are in a purified state or not; or, according to Mr. O.'s manner of stating the position, that the members of the Christian Church, by virtue of their church-membership will be *sure* to be saved, "*whatever be their characters.*"

On this occasion, therefore, Mr. O. appears to have brought his charge against the wrong party. The assurance of salvation certainly has a place among the doctrines of J. CALVIN, but it as certainly is not to be found among the doctrines of the Church of England. It might have been fairly presumed, therefore, that the author of "a Guide to that Church," could not mean to become advocate for a doctrine, which that Church professedly disavows:

I proceed to the next proof of my opposing those who "contend for internal and practical Christianity," which will be found standing on ground equally firm with the last. "The distinction between the *national establishment* and the *true Church* of Christ, Mr. DAUBENY teaches, is unnecessary, and a false distinction. That (he says) may be a true

Church, in which the pure word of God is not preached. That the spirituality of divine worship is essential to the *very being and constitution* of a Church, is more, he adds, than will be granted, because the Church of Christ has, at different times, been permitted to exist without it." P. 116.

Mr. O. said before, that Mr. DAUBENY sees no difference between the *true* Church of Christ, and the *national* Church. It has been already observed, that these words, *thus constructed*, are not to be found in any of the parts of my writings to which Mr. O. refers. Still, as applied to the Church of England, I see no reason to disavow them. It shall be admitted, then, (to grant Mr. O. every thing he has advanced) that Mr. DAUBENY does not see any difference between the *true* Church of Christ, and the *national* Church; and for the following, to him at least, evident reason, because the established *national* Church in this country is a branch of the *true* visible Church of Christ. When Mr. O. shall have pointed out the difference which subsists in his mind, or in the minds of those "*regular Clergy of the establishment*" whose cause he advocates, between the *true Church* of Christ, and the *national* Church, of which they are the *appointed* ministers, it will be time enough for Mr. DAUBENY to reply to it. In the mean while it may be thought, that Mr. O.'s objection to my language in this case has originated in a lack of precision on his part, by which he has

been led to confound the nature of a *true Church*, with the character of *the true members of it*.

To judge, however, of the legitimacy of Mr. O.'s conclusion, my reader must refer to the pages in question; keeping in mind the charge they are intended to substantiate; namely, that by laying down the positions here brought under review, I am to be considered as opposing those who "contend for internal and practical Christianity." For if *this* charge be not proved by his premises, Mr. O. must of necessity be *non-suited*. In evidence of the first position, that I teach "the distinction between the *national* establishment and the *true Church* of Christ to be unnecessary, and a false distinction," appeal is made to pages 475 and 476 of the "Appendix." Now it is obvious that there are two modes of quoting from an author; one consists in citing his *words*, the other in quoting his *sense*. By the first he may be sometimes made to say what he never meant. But when an author's *sense* is brought forward, the words being then taken in connection with their subject, all misrepresentation of his meaning is fairly precluded.

The former mode, that of quoting words *only*, and this sometimes after a very mutilated manner, Mr. O., and the Editors of the *Christian Observer*, appear to prefer in their treatment of my writings. This, it must be acknowledged, is a very convenient and summary method of making good a charge against an author, whose opinions we wish to coun-

teract; but it is a method, which, though, through the infirmity of human nature, it prevails too often in controversy, every honest man ought to discountenance. From this mode of quoting, therefore, which, it may be hoped, has been inadvertently adopted, it becomes necessary that my reader should form no opinion concerning my sentiments, but from what, upon examination, he shall find me saying for myself. On turning to p. 475 of the "Appendix," to which the first reference is made, it will be seen, that I am replying to that imaginary distinction by some attempted to be made between the established Church of this country and the Church of CHRIST, as if they formed two different and distinct societies. Addressing myself to Sir RICHARD HILL, in allusion to what he had said on this head, I write thus: "In page 199, you unnecessarily put the idea into your reader's head, that a 'national establishment is *one thing*, and a Christian Church, *another*.' I say, *unnecessarily*, because we have nothing to do with the subject. In *this country* a national establishment and a Christian Church are *one* and the *same thing*; for, happily for us, they are in unison together. Moreover, you must know, Sir, that the Church of England is not defended, and the necessity of communion with it enforced, because it is a *national* establishment, but because it is an *Apostolic Church of Christ*." &c.

My reader will now judge, what degree of proof this first position contributes towards substantiating the charge under consideration. He will doubtless see, that to guard against a *false* distinction made between the *national* establishment and the Christian Church, for the purpose of preventing plain, uninformed Christians from breaking away from that order and government, by which the Church, as a visible society, was designed to be held together, is in no respect to oppose those who "contend for internal and practical Christianity." The next position taken, not according to Mr. O.'s margin from p. 252, for *there* no such position is to be found, but from p. 404 of the "Appendix," is this; "that may be a *true Church*, in which the pure word of God is not preached." In the page here referred to, it will be readily perceived, that the object in view was to counteract a false opinion relative to the Christian Church, founded on a partial construction of the 19th Article; from which Sir RICHARD had attempted to shew, that every congregation of Christian people, where the pure word of God is preached, constitutes a Church. Considering this position as calculated to do away all idea of the Church, as a society regularly established under an appropriate government, and to introduce as many independent Churches among us as there might be congregations of Christian people, to the utter destruction of all unity, it was on that account inadmissible. Sir RICHARD

had proceeded further to say, "that where the pure word of God was not preached, *no true Church* exists; and in that case the *parochial* temple becomes a conventicle, and the Minister of the Church a schismatic." With the view of pointing out the inconclusiveness of a mode of reasoning, which confounded two crimes, in their nature so distinct from each other as *heresy* and *schism*, by making the *purity of doctrine* the standard by which to judge of both; my observation was, that "that may be a *true Church*, in which the pure word of God is not preached." Now as my object on this occasion was evidently to guard the established Church of this country from the ill effects of a *false principle*, it might be supposed, that with writers, who, from their profession, ought to have the support of the same excellent Church in view, I should have been given credit for my intended meaning. This insulated quotation, however, Mr. O. has brought forward, as the Christian Observer has since done in the same manner, and apparently for the same purpose; namely, that of leading their readers to a belief, that purity of doctrine was with me a matter of no consequence, provided the doctrine, whatever it might be, was preached in the Church. But had Mr. O., or the Editors of the Christian Observer, been as desirous to do justice to a brother Minister, as they appear disposed to misrepresent him; in quoting from his page, they would not have stopped short

where they did, but proceeded to the sentence immediately subjoined to the one they have thought fit to notice; which would have convinced their readers, that I was speaking of the purity of doctrine in *no other sense*, than with a view to the subject immediately before me—that of making it the *only* standard by which to determine the existence of the Church. *Pure doctrine* may be preached out of the Church, as well as in it. Consequently *purity of doctrine*, considered *abstractedly*, cannot constitute the only characteristic by which the Church is to be known. To prove this *a fortiori*, I proceed to observe, that “that may be a true Church, in which the pure word of God is not preached.” But to mark the sense in which such position is to be received, and to which it is restrained, I go on to say, “It is a Church *in error*, if you please, and consequently not what it ought to be; but error in a Church does not destroy its *constitution*. Error may be reformed, and the Church thereby restored to perfection.” To substantiate this position, the Churches of Asia mentioned in the Revelations, and the present Church of Rome, are brought forward as examples of true Churches being permitted to exist in an actual state of corruption.

It would be an affront to my reader's understanding, to detain him longer on this head; I proceed, therefore, to the next position, taken from the 482d page of the “Appendix,” namely, “that the



spirituality of divine worship is essential to *the very being* and *constitution* of a Church, is more than will be granted; because the Church of CHRIST has, at different times, been permitted to exist without it." This position says only in different words, what has been already said, and with the same object. It has, however, been brought forward both by Mr. O. and the Christian Observer, for the similar purpose of proving, that the religion of our Church is, in my judgment, more a religion of *form* than of *spirit*. But to warrant such conclusion, it must first be proved that the premises, as contained in my pages, and as placed in those of Mr. O., and the Christian Observer, do really bear on the same point. But a comparison of the pages will shew, that this is not the case. It will shew, that while they are speaking of the spirituality of religion, in its reference to the character of the individual members of the Church; I am, in strict conformity with the subject before me, speaking of it *only* with the view to its being considered as the infallible characteristic by which the existence of the Christian Church, as a visible society, was to be determined. It must be clearly seen, that what may be affirmed in the one case, is not to be equally affirmed in the other. That the spirituality of divine worship is essential to the character of the *true* member of the Church is most certain; because no man can, in the proper sense of the words, be a *true* member of the Church

without it. But that the spirituality of divine worship is *so* essential to the *very being* and constitution of a Church, that the Church can at no time *exist* without it, is certainly not true, because facts contradict it. It is, therefore, not less against the rules of good logic, than against the dictates of sound sense, to make what is predicated in different senses of different subjects, meet in the same conclusion.

But this point has been already so fully discussed in my "Letter to a sound Churchman," now before the public, that it would be to trespass on my reader to enlarge further upon it. I shall conclude upon this head, therefore, with observing, that, by a reference to my pages, my object will be seen to have been that of enabling my reader to form a correct judgment of the Christian Church, by furnishing him with precise ideas on that most important subject. To this end it was necessary, that he should discriminate between the purity of doctrine simply considered, and the divine commission by which the Church, as a society, has been established in the world; and that, although both were intended by the Divine Founder of the Church to *co-exist*, as essential to the perfection of his gracious design; still, that the occasional absence of the former did not *necessarily* destroy the *very being* and *constitution* of the latter. The conclusion to be drawn from which premises was evidently meant to be this:—That *spiritual worship* must

not be considered as superseding the necessity of the divine commission; nor must the divine commission be considered as supplying the defect of spiritual worship. In other words, the divine institution of the Church is to be preserved for the sake of preserving the purity of doctrine; and the purity of doctrine is to be maintained, not with the view that Christians should thereby be rendered independent of the divine institution, but for the sake of rendering that institution effectual to its intended object; the *spiritual edification* and *consequent salvation* of her members.

This has been already said to the editors of the Christian Observer; and more, it is presumed, is not necessary to be said for the conviction of my present reader. Unless, therefore, Mr. O. can bring the pious Bishop HALL in guilty of opposing those who "contend for internal and practical Christianity," because he maintained the Church of Rome to be a *true* Church, though a *corrupt* one, he will in vain attempt to fasten that charge on any other Christian divine, merely for maintaining the same position. And should Mr. O. not really possess that precision of ideas necessary to qualify him to discriminate between a *true* Church and a *pure* one, the ministers whose cause he has taken up, have certainly no great reason to pride themselves in the abilities of their advocate.

The only remaining page to be noticed in this Chapter is the 121st, in which my name is again

introduced. “ Mr. D. says, *experimental* conviction leads to delusion.” Mr. D. does not say so, *totidem verbis*, according to Mr. O.’s reference, in p. 618 of the Appendix ; although it shall be admitted, that such a conclusion may be drawn from his words. Still the words should have been left to speak for themselves ; and when taken with their context, I see no reason to disown them. In answer to Sir RICHARD HILL’s speaking of “ an inward experimental conviction, which brings with it an evidence more forcible than that of the clearest logical conclusions,” I say, “ an inward experimental conviction is a *something* that does not admit of a logical answer. It is in vain, therefore, to attempt one. But the Archbishop directs the Christian to ‘ be ready to give a *reason* for the faith that is in him.’ A reason may be understood, an experimental conviction may not ; it is a thing to be felt, rather than described. The party himself can at no time be sure that he is not deceived by it. To exchange, therefore, a *rational account* of our faith for an *experimental conviction* of it, is to substitute the work of the imagination for that of the judgment ; a proceeding which opens the door to most dangerous and endless delusions.” When we speak of an inward experimental conviction in religion, which opens the door to dangerous delusions, it will be concluded by the candid reader, that we must mean those imaginary sensations, by which en-

thusiasts impose upon themselves and others, in the description of their spiritual condition ; but, at the same time, not to deny that comfortable experience, which pious and sober Christians feel, in consequence of the effect produced on the powers and dispositions of their minds by the doctrines of Christianity rightly appreciated. My language applied exclusively to the case of *Enthusiasts*. Whether, or in what degree, it applied to those Evangelical ministers for whom Mr. O. pleads, was not the point in question. The consideration of the over-ruling Providence of an All-Wise and All-Gracious God ; the reliance on his promises ; the contemplation of his stupendous mercy in CHRIST ; the acknowledgment of his abundant grace in the mission of his Holy Spirit ; the consequent expectation and ardent desire of eternal happiness ; such sentiments and dispositions, produced by the knowledge of religion, are matters of experience. And *though* these sentiments and dispositions cannot prove the truth of our religion, for this evident reason, because we cannot have the evidence of *experience* either for the *past facts*, or the *future effects*, of Christianity ; yet they certainly shew the reality and sincerity of our belief of it, and more than this no *experience* can possibly afford. “ We can know, (says Mr. LUDLAM, in his most excellent Essay on this subject) from our own experience, what degree of credit we have given to the evidences of Christianity ; what degree of regard

we do pay to the scriptures; what quantity of knowledge we receive from them; what effect this knowledge has upon our affections; what influence it has upon our conduct. This is the *proper* and the only province of *experience*; this is the true and only use we can make of it in religion, whatever else may be pretended." At the same time, it is carefully to be kept in mind, that experience in religion furnishes conviction but to the party concerned in it; and even to him, it is a proof only of the *sincerity of his belief*, but neither is nor can be a proof of the *reality of the thing believed*. And as the imagination is often known to take place of actual experience, in affections which immediately respect the body, it may be supposed to act with still greater force, when confined solely to the operations of the mind; and, therefore, must be considered as constituting that ground for judgment, on which no sure dependence should be built. As it was not my design, nor would be a work for which I am qualified, to enter into this part of Mr. O.'s publication, further than it bears immediately on myself, I pass on to the winding-up of this Chapter.

Mr. O., in p. 126, admits, that the divines, against whom he is writing, "speak of repentance, faith, and obedience, as the conditions of justification, and actual salvation. This (says he) it is not our business to reconcile with their present language." Should the divines in question be really so inconsistent

with themselves as they are here represented, their case is a desperate one, and it certainly is not incumbent on Mr. O. to undertake it. But as a brother clergyman, I may take leave to remind Mr. O. of what it is incumbent on charity, which "thinketh no evil," to do in this case; namely, to attribute any conclusion to that effect, which particular passages in their writings may appear to justify, to some misconception of their language, or inattention to the subject on the part of their readers, rather than to any dereliction of principle in the writers.

The passages brought from my writings for the purpose of substantiating Mr. O.'s charge, my reader has seen to be quite foreign to the subject under consideration, and consequently proving nothing to his point. That the writings of others have not been more honourably dealt with, must be admitted to be, at least, a fair presumption. But though Mr. O. appears to have no reserve upon his mind, when engaged in denouncing sentence against his clerical brethren, still he does not appear to have equally made up his mind with respect to the charge brought against them. It contains, indeed, at all times what is sufficiently disgraceful to their character, and contradictory to their profession; but, from an apparent zeal to fill up the measure of their iniquity, Mr. O. has put together a charge which carries the principle of its own confutation along with it; because it is a charge made up of such heterogeneous parts, as

cannot possibly meet together in the same persons; and of which the reader, should he give himself the trouble to analyze it, will probably say, what the poet applied to another subject,

“ Quodcunque ostendis mihi *sic*, incredulus odi.”

The divines, for instance, under sentence, in which number I am placed by name, who, in p. 126, are admitted to “ speak of repentance, faith, and obedience, as the *conditions of justification and actual salvation* ;” language, which if it means any thing, must mean that *without repentance, faith, and obedience*, no Christian can be saved ; it is the purpose of the present Chapter to represent as maintaining the very opposite doctrine, namely, that all persons admitted into the Church by Baptism, in consequence of their having been thereby placed in a state of salvation, will be saved, let them live how they may ; or, in Mr. O.’s words, “ *whatever be their characters*.” And by thus “ treating all as *real* Christians who assume the Christian name, and comply with the external forms of our religion,” p. 107, these divines are represented to be opposers of all practical Christianity. But in page 113, these same divines, by the application to them of a quotation from Bishop HORSLEY’S charge, (whom Mr. O. has made to speak in a much more unqualified manner than he Bishop has spoken, or would think himself justified in speaking, of the great body of the Clergy) are at



least given credit for inculcating practical Christianity, though not on the right principle. "It is an established maxim among the Clergy, Bishop HORSLEY informs us, (as Mr. O. thinks proper to state the Bishop's language) "that it is more the office of a Christian teacher to press the *practice* of religion upon the consciences of his hearers, than to inculcate and assert its *doctrines*."\* *To press the*

\* The Bishop's own words are subjoined, that the reader may see in what manner the Bishop has been pressed into Mr. O.'s service. "A just abhorrence of those virulent animosities which in all ages, since external persecution ceased, have prevailed among Christians; especially since the Reformation, among Protestants of the different denominations, upon the pretence at least of certain differences of opinion, in points of nice and doubtful disputation; hath introduced and given a general currency to a maxim, which seemed to promise peace and unity, by dismissing the cause, or rather the pretence, of discussion; namely, that the Laity, the more illiterate especially, have little concern with the mysteries of revealed religion, provided they be attentive to its duties. Whence it hath seemed a *safe and certain conclusion*, that it is more the office of a Christian teacher to press the practice of religion upon the consciences of his hearers, than to inculcate and assert its doctrines." Charge, p. 5, 6. The above general remark, to be applied by the reader in a greater or less extent, according to his own judgment and observation; by substituting for the Bishop's words, "*it hath seemed a safe and certain conclusion*," the words, "*it is an established maxim among the Clergy*," Mr. O. has converted into a direct and indiscriminate charge against the Clergy as a body. "It is an established maxim among the Clergy, Bishop HORSLEY informs us." So writes Mr. O. But Bishop HORSLEY, as my reader has seen, gives no such information. This practice, which some controversialists do not scruple to adopt, of exchanging the words of the author quoted, for words of their own, with the view of bringing the passage more close to their purpose, is among those petty arts of controversy, not more unnecessary to the cause of truth, than they are disgraceful to the party who employs them.

*practice* of religion upon the consciences of our hearers in any way, surely differs widely from giving them to understand that they will be saved, "*whatever be their characters;*" and that having been baptized, they may continue in sin, because grace will abound.

In another part of this Chapter (p. 101) it is insinuated, that the divines in question "consider it their chief business to be the apes of EPICTETUS, PLATO, and SENECA." But the morality of EPICTETUS, PLATO, and SENECA, is still to be preferred to *no morality at all*. And there can be no doubt, but that a true disciple of these distinguished heathen moralists will stand on much safer ground in the day of judgment, than a baptized person, who, in conformity with the doctrine said to be taught by the divines in question, leads an immoral life within the pale of the Christian Church.

But the charge generally brought against divines not of the *Calvinistic* persuasion has been understood to be, that they preach morality *too much*, lay too great stress on *works*, and attribute too little to *faith*. By representing them, therefore, according to the purport of the present Chapter, as *no moralists at all*; as giving their hearers to understand, that all *baptized persons* certainly will be saved, "*whatever be their characters;*" because they have been baptized; appears to be attacking them, as it were, in their strong hold; unless such an attack may be con-

sidered to be an ingenious manœuvre, for the purpose of making those divines, who reprobate the doctrine of Calvinistic election, responsible for *an absurdity*, of which the maintainers of that doctrine have been often convicted.

The reader, however, by looking forward to p. 199 of Mr. O.'s publication, will find, that two at least of the divines, whom it is the object of this Chapter to represent as inculcating, not heathen morality, but no morality at all, are given credit for maintaining faith and works together to be necessary to salvation. "It might be observed," says Mr. O., "we may be justified *by our* works, although not *for* them: They may be the stipulated *condition* of justification, although they do not *merit* it. No, replies the Article, it is '*by faith*:' That is, adds some Dr. CROFT, or Mr. DAUBENY, "*by faith and works together*." P. 199.

Now what difference of opinion soever there may be relative to the degree of weight which the works of a Christian have in the scale of Divine judgment, still, according to the doctrine of the divines in question, they are works necessary to be produced *in order to salvation*. This doctrine, therefore, is in direct variance with that for which these same divines are made chargeable in the present Chapter, by which the necessity of works of any kind, in order to the salvation of the baptized party, is totally superseded.

“But,” proceeds Mr. O., “it must seem from the whole tenor of what has now appeared, that although they (the divines against whom this Chapter is written)  *speak*  of these things, yet that a renewed heart and a holy life are not made a  *sine quâ non*  in the character of a true Christian.” P. 126. This is in other words to say, that the divines in question  *speak*  of things they do not mean; and inculcate the doctrines of repentance, faith, and obedience, as doctrines to be talked or preached about, according to the French phrase,  *pour passer le tems* , but not as necessary to salvation. But in what manner this unqualified assertion, which ingeniously attempts to shift a charge, for which Calvinistic ministers have generally, and too often justly, been made responsible, upon other shoulders, has been substantiated, the reader has seen and will judge.

Mr. O., in p. 96, declares loudly, and with justice, against any writer “deducing his consequences, and assuming the prerogative of knowing men’s hearts; and insisting upon it, in spite of themselves, that they hold doctrines which they say and believe they do not.” On the supposition that it was the same Mr. O. wrote the preceding passage, who wrote the page under present consideration, it may be asked, what divine patent he has to produce, which will exempt him from the operation of his own principle; by authorizing him to advance a bold and uncharitable assertion, which can be justified only

by a thorough knowledge both of the hearts and minds of the parties whom it concerns? "But," continues Mr. O., "our argument does not require us to decide upon this matter." Mr. O. might have said that no argument he could produce, would enable him to decide on this matter; and for this evident reason, because contradictory premises, such as those he has laid down, cannot possibly lead to a decided conclusion on any subject whatever; however they may justify a decided opinion on the party who employs them.

Mr. O.'s reasoning, by way of conclusion to this Chapter, if I understand him, amounts to this: In the opening of the present Chapter, a charge of the most gross unqualified nature has been brought against the great body of the clergy, whom Mr. O. considers in the light of opponents. That charge, by appeals (such as they have been) to the writings of the clergy in question, Mr. O. considers to have been substantiated. But lest any doubt should remain on the minds of his readers, relative to the strength of the proof adduced, Mr. O. takes care to invalidate an argument, that might be brought against it from some passages to be found in the writings of the divines in question, by observing, that although "these gentlemen, at other times, speak of repentance, faith, and obedience, as the conditions of justification and actual salvation; yet they must be considered as only '*speaking of these things*;' while

“a renewed heart, and a holy life, are not made a *sine quâ non* in the character of a true Christian.” Whether this be the real state of the case or not, “our argument,” continues Mr. O., “does not require us to decide.” “But however this may be, what we insist upon in conclusion of our enquiry, is this, that these divines must hold—either that *all* professed Christians who are members of our Church, ‘*whatever be their characters,*’ are in a state of acceptance with God, and would go to heaven, should they die in their present state; or that only *some* of such persons are in this state, namely, those whose characters correspond with their profession.” Surely now the title to the Chapter before us should have been, “*Much ado about nothing;*” for the gross and unqualified charge with which this Chapter commences, together with the proof that succeeds to it, terminates at length in the following hypothetical conclusion—either the clergy, against whom this charge has been brought, are sound ministers of the Church of England, or they are not. “If the former position (namely that all baptized Christians, *whatever be their characters,* will be saved) be maintained by them, we pronounce it,” says Mr. O. “licentious, unscriptural, and directly opposite to the most plain and express doctrine of our Church. If the latter proposition (that those only, whose characters correspond with their profession, are in a state of acceptance with God) be adhered to, then must

they admit a distinction between the good and the evil." My reader, perhaps, will think that Mr. O. should have inverted his order of writing on this occasion, by beginning where he has concluded; by setting out *hypothetically*, and concluding *definitively*; by saying, in the first place, that if such a position be maintained, such must be our judgment upon it; and then proving (if it was to be proved) that such position, for which the divines in question are condemned, was actually maintained by them. But Mr. O. has thought proper to begin with a decided unqualified charge, and after taking up some pages with his endeavours to establish it *quocunque modo*, his attack upon the professional character of his brethren at length terminates in his retiring as it were from the field, which he begins to feel himself unable to maintain, by leaving the matter in a manner open to be determined by his readers, whether the charge under consideration has ground to stand upon, or not.

At the same time, in the true Parthian mode of fighting, with the view of giving the parting wound to his adversary, Mr. O. concludes with leaving an impression on his reader's mind, built on the supposition, that the charge, which it was the professed object of this Chapter to substantiate, had been *clearly* and *incontrovertibly* made out. "In reference then," concludes Mr. O., "to the whole which has been advanced in this Chapter, we appeal to all

competent judges to say, whose teaching most resembles that of the Church, and her Reformers, on these subjects; *ours*, who make Christ and his peculiar doctrines the soul which animates the whole body of our divinity, or *theirs*, who make so little use of the SAVIOUR, and these doctrines; *ours*, who thus insist upon internal and practical Christianity, or *theirs*, who rest so much upon mere externals, and use the language which has been exhibited?"

The cause Mr. O. has at length submitted to the proper tribunal; and we readily submit to the verdict, which competent judges shall pronounce on the contents of the foregoing Chapter; taking leave only, on my own account, to remark, that, admitting that Mr. O., for want of attention to the subject to which the quotations from my writings immediately refer, might *unintentionally* misrepresent them; still, on the supposition that he read for himself, passages were to be found in my books, of a nature sufficiently decided to have convinced him, that the meaning for which he has thought proper to make their author responsible, could not possibly be the meaning intended to be conveyed by him. One passage taken from the "Guide" shall speak for the rest, because it contains, in a small compass, a full refutation of all Mr. O. has attempted to prove against the author of it, in the Chapter before us. Describing what the character of Christ's disciples ought to be, I proceed thus—"Admitting faith in Christ to be, if we



may so say, the grand germinating principle of the whole spiritual creation, they (Christ's disciples) must not only abide in him, but *his spirit must also abide in them*, if they would become what Christianity was designed to make them. The *shadow* in this case will not be taken for the *substance*. As members of his Church, we may, in *some sense*, be said to be in CHRIST; but being *dead*, not *living* members of it, we are, in such case, those unfruitful branches of the vine, which the husbandman taketh away."—Guide, p. 294, 295.

And when Mr. O. has read, should he think proper so to do, a set of doctrinal discourses on the connection between the Old and New Testament, lately published by the author of "the Guide to the Church;" it is possible, though these discourses may not be exactly to his taste, that they may bear sufficient testimony for their author, even with Mr. O., to induce him to wish, that what he has so uncharitably and inconsiderately advanced in this Chapter, together with what he scruples not to say, in p. 378, of the divines in question, "that they are great enemies to the doctrine of salvation by grace," had never been committed to the public.

## CHAPTER IV.

*The Inquiry pursued with regard to the Doctrine of Original Sin, and the consequent State and Character of Man in this World as a Sinner.*

**W**ERE I to follow Mr. O. step by step throughout his multifarious publication, my book must necessarily be extended to an unmeasurable length; there being but few pages of it, comparatively speaking, which do not present either some assertion to be contradicted, some statement to be corrected, or some misrepresentation to be pointed out. But besides the charge of incorrectness, to which Mr. O. is justly obnoxious, he abounds in that indecent and unqualified censure on the parties who are the immediate objects of attack, that no clergyman, desirous of preserving the dignity of his character, can answer it as it ought to be answered. On this account it may continue to boast of a title by which its approvers distinguish it, namely, that of its being *unanswerable*.

These considerations have determined me to confine my attention to the more prominent features of Mr. O.'s work; concluding that a sufficient specimen

of his method of quoting and reasoning has been seen, to render a more particular examination of it unnecessary. The object of the Chapter on which we are now entering, is to prove, that the divines, on whose professional character Mr. O. sits in judgment, are equally defective in the doctrine of *original sin*, as they are in every other part of the Christian system. To establish this point, according to his usual manner of proving, some few individuals are brought forward, in the character of the foreman of a jury, to speak for the body. But Mr. O. seems to forget through his whole performance the principle, on which alone the foreman of a jury speaks the sense of the body he represents. Without regard to this principle, Mr. O., by way of preparing his readers for the application which he has in view, lays before him the expressions of Bishop LAW, Dr. PALEY, Bishop WARBURTON, Bishop WATSON, Dr. TAYLOR, and others, on this doctrinal point; and after occupying many pages on stating, in his own way, the sentiments of sundry other writers, at different periods, on the same subject, he draws, in p. 140, the evidence he has collected from all quarters, as it were, into a focus; by saying of the divines, on whom his publication is immediately meant to bear, that "it is the doctrine of nearly the whole body, that the will of man is free to choose what is good." P. 140. For the confirmation of this charge Mr. O. appeals to the 5th discourse of the "Guide,"

and *passim*. If, however, in that part of my writings here particularly specified, no such sentiment is to be found; my reader's time may be better employed, than in pursuing the wild goose-chace marked out for him under the convenient word *passim*.

The 5th discourse of the "Guide" treats principally of the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute decrees and irresistible grace. But the doctrine for which it is here made responsible, is certainly not to be found in it. The only page of it in which the *free agency* of man is mentioned, is the 92d, where, speaking of the extreme into which they ran, who, effectually to get rid of the Romish doctrine of merit, brought forward that of absolute unconditional election and irresistible grace, I proceed thus—"This was indeed to do the business at a stroke; but it was a stroke which severely wounded the cause it was meant to serve. By taking away man's free agency, an end was at once put to the morality and immorality of human actions; for a being whose conduct is determined by an overruling power, cannot be an accountable one. Thus a corrupt doctrine made way for a species of *fatalism*, which, under an imposing title, tends to deprive rational Christianity of its firmest support."—Guide, p. 92. Hence, concludes Mr. O., it is Mr. D.'s doctrine, "that the will of man is free to choose what is good." Thus Mr. O. reasons; as if there were no line to be drawn between the heresy of PELAGIUS, and the

degradation of a reasonable creature into a *mere machine*. Had Mr. O. consulted St. AUSTIN, he would have learnt, that the free will of man may be spoken of in a *sound* sense, without subjecting the party to any suspicion of heretical pravity on the subject. For St. AUSTIN himself, the great opposer of the Pelagian heresy, wrote thus:

“Tolle liberum arbitrium, quomodo DEUS judicabit?

‘Tolle gratiam, quomodo salvabit mundum?’”

Take away free will, how will God judge the world?

Take away grace, how will he save it?

Mr. O., however, with the view of more fully substantiating his charge, proceeds to examine what *our Church* (in italics, by way of insinuating that the divines, on whom he sits in judgment, are at variance with the Church) teaches on the subject. P. 141. And after having spent some pages in drawing forth the evidence furnished by our Articles, Homilies, and early writings on this subject, in p. 154 he pronounces sentence on the *general* body, from proofs, which, even admitting they speak the sense with which he makes them chargeable, bear only on the character of the *individuals*, from whose writings they are taken. “And now,” says Mr. O., “whose doctrine most resembles hers? (the Church of England.) *Ours*, who speak strongly on the subject; or *theirs*, who so labour to lower and extenuate it? Is it possible for those divines, who treat this doctrine in the manner which has been specified, to believe

that they agree with the Church upon it?" P. 154.  
 "This, then, is the agreement with our Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies, of which *these Churchmen* boast! In this manner do they teach the doctrines contained in the formularies as they were first delivered by our Reformers!" P. 157. This surely is very confident language, and to be justified only by the most unequivocal proof. Such, however, is the burden of Mr. O.'s charge and sentence against the the divines in question on this subject; in which number I am classed by name. For we are told that "*these Churchmen*, as they are sneeringly called, do not teach the doctrine of *original sin*, as it is contained in our formularies. That, on the contrary, they maintain that man has by *nature* 'a will to choose what is good.' That he is able, as *mere man*, to perform such good works as shall attract the regard of the LORD of life, and render him worthy of Christ's mediation." P. 140. "That they mightily extol his reason as sufficient, *without any supernatural* assistance, to enter into the true meaning of GOD's word, and to attain all requisite knowledge in divine things." That they "teach, with almost one voice, like the Papists, the doctrine of free will, &c." P. 156. It by no means follows, that because the divines in question make use of more precise and guarded language on these delicate subjects, than Calvinists have been generally remarked for, that therefore they mean to maintain the error which

Mr. O. is anxious to fix upon them. But without taking upon me to ascertain the meaning of other writers, I may perhaps be allowed to determine my own; and should any language be to be found in my writings, sufficiently perspicuous to render that meaning unequivocal, it is to be expected that I should be given credit for it.

It has been observed, that it is a practice with Mr. O. to enter into laboured demonstrations and defences of the most acknowledged truths; with the view, as it should seem, of leading his more ignorant readers to believe, that the opposers of his particular opinions deny those general truths. The present Chapter is not without an example of this practice. In p. 157, Mr. O. thus describes the doctrine of the Evangelical ministers, whose cause he advocates. "We," says he, "can only teach, that every man who is born, considered independent of the grace of God, and in respect to spiritual concerns, is wholly corrupt, utterly impotent, under the wrath of God, and liable to everlasting torments; all which, in the very fullest manner, is done here." From which his readers are led to infer that "these Churchmen," the objects of Mr. O.'s censure, do really maintain the opposite doctrine. To such an insidious mode of indirect crimination, a formal reply will not be expected. It will save the reader's time to put the matter to a short issue. If, then, with the Bible and the Articles of the Church of England before me,

I have, in any part of my writings, taught that doctrine, for which Mr. O. has here thought proper to make me responsible, I ought to take shame to myself. But should the fact be otherwise, the shame in such case must attach to Mr. O., as the public bearer of *false witness* against his brother minister.

Now as Mr. O., by his numerous references to my writings, must be supposed generally conversant with them, I would ask him, without any of those harsh terms which he so frequently delights to use, how it happens, that he has passed over wholly unnoticed that part which bears so immediately on the present subject; and which, as it contradicts in the most decided language the charge, so far as it concerns myself, may reasonably be concluded to invalidate it, so far also as it is generally applied; it being fair to presume, that the same measure has been dealt to others, that has been meted to me. As Mr. O. has not thought proper to do me this justice, it becomes necessary that I should do justice to myself, by the insertion of the following comment on the Ninth and Tenth Articles, to be found in the Third Letter of the "Appendix." P. 147.

"The Ninth Article of the Church treats of *original or birth sin*; by which is understood to be meant, that mental depravity entailed upon human nature, in consequence of the fall of ADAM; in the words of the Article, 'the fault and corruption of every man, whereby man is very far gone from original



righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil; which natural inclination to evil deserves God's wrath and damnation.' The doctrine, therefore, contained in this Article is this—that human nature has been corrupted, and that in that state it deserves punishment. In this state every man is born, a fallen son of fallen ADAM; and although by baptism he is born into a new state, a state of grace and acceptance with GOD through CHRIST; yet the infection of his nature still remains, and so far as it doth remain, hath of itself, the nature of sin. In this light, admission into Christianity by baptism is to be considered as the putting man in a way, by which, through the *operation of the Spirit*, he may become so purified from his natural corruption, as to be qualified for the salvation which has been purchased for him. The Tenth Article is but a corollary to the ninth. The doctrine contained in it is obvious, and briefly this—that, in consequence of man's alienation from GOD and spiritual things, he must, through CHRIST, have the *grace of God to enable him both to will and to do good works*, pleasant and acceptable to GOD.

“The Ninth Article describes the *natural* state of man, in consequence of the fall. The Tenth points out the remedy, by *which alone* man is to be recovered from it. This Article professes to treat of *free-will*. By which term we understand, that although no man, in an *unregenerate* state, has any free will, *but to do evil*; being, whilst in that state, under

subjection to his fallen nature; yet, by the *grace of God in CHRIST*, he possesses a degree of free will towards the performance of spiritual services, for the non-performance of which he will be accountable. For the negative proposition contained in this Article, that no man has power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, *without* the grace of God, includes within it the positive one; viz. that, *with that grace*, good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, may be performed by him. ‘I can do all things,’ &c. Phil. iv. 13. ‘I laboured more abundantly,’ &c. I Cor. xv. 10. ‘Work out your salvation,’ &c. Phil. ii. 12. A direction which furnishes a plain comment upon the foregoing Article, by making the assistance of Divine grace an argument for human exertion.”

With this extract before him, my reader is prepared to appreciate the conclusion of this Chapter in the following language, on which I leave him to sit in judgment. “Is it not then, so far, pretty clear to whom the charge of ‘*gross misrepresentation*’ belongs? Nay, were that compatible with the doctrines of our Church, might we not almost be indignant at these Gentlemen? How can they come forward, in the grave character of Divines, to criminate others who are innocent, upon the *very points* in which they are *so notoriously guilty themselves*? If this has not been proved with regard to the present doctrine, how shall we be able to prove any thing?

And if it has, it will be easy to prove the same, concerning any other fundamental doctrine of the Church; they will all necessarily take their different complexions according to our different ideas here."

—Grant Mr. O. every thing he assumes, admit the correctness of all his assertions, and let there be no defect in his logic, and his proofs will then bid fair to be complete.

---

## CHAPTER V.

*The Investigation continued, with respect to the  
Doctrine of Repentance.*

NOT perceiving, from the examination of Mr. O.'s margin, any reference made to my writings on the subject handled in this Chapter, and observing nothing in it, but what appears conformable to the doctrine of the Church of England; I congratulate myself and my reader on the liberty allowed me of passing it over unnoticed.

## CHAPTER VI.

### *The Question prosecuted with regard to the Doctrine of Justification.*

**O**N the subject to which this Chapter directs our attention, much more has been written than appears necessary to its perfect illustration. The real merits of it lie in a narrow compass; and by a writer in the habit of annexing clear and precise ideas to the words he uses, may be comprehended in a few sentences.

But the misfortune is, that on the subject now before us, more perhaps than on most others in the religious system, writers seem to have been less solicitous to understand, than to contradict each other. What has been written upon it, has been often written, rather with a view to the support of a pre-established system, than with a singleness of eye to the truth; and hence, whilst words have been multiplied, readers have been confounded much more than they have been edified.

That gross and profitable error which had been long fostered in the bosom of a corrupt Church, relative to the doctrine of human merit, it was the

object of our Reformers effectually to do away, by the contrary, decided, unequivocal doctrine of Justification by Faith in the merits of a crucified Saviour; to the total exclusion of all other merit whatever. At the same time, to guard against the abuse which had been grafted upon this Evangelical doctrine, it was equally in their view to ascertain and to mark the precise nature of that faith, to which alone, according to the tenor of the Gospel covenant, such important benefit was annexed. Whoever, therefore, considers Christ to be the only *meritorious cause* of man's salvation, and works as requisite to determine the quality of that faith, which can alone be instrumental to the salvation of the party, will believe every thing necessary to be believed on this important subject. In such case, he will clearly distinguish between the grand hinge, on which human salvation turns; and those corresponding circumstances, which, in conformity with the wisdom of the Divine plan, are not to be separated from it. He will see that works, the fruit of faith; whilst, to make use of the language of our Reformers, they are decidedly "shut out from the *office* of justifying," must still be present in the justified party, (in all cases where works are possible) as that *sine quâ non*, without which he will not finally be saved. "For without holiness (we are told) no man shall see the LORD." This necessary discrimination between man's *title* to salvation and his *personal quali-*

*fication* for it, contains the whole pith of the argument employed on this much, though in my judgment, unnecessarily controverted subject.

Such are the positions, which the general tenor of my writings, if I may be allowed to understand myself, is calculated, in strict agreement with the doctrine of the Church of England, to maintain. How far they have been done justice to by Mr. O., the reader is now to judge; and my only desire is to enable him to judge *fairly*.

Mr. O. opens his attack against his opponents on this subject, by objecting to their maintenance of *two justifications*—a *first* and a *final* justification. To prejudice his readers against which distinction, he represents it as made by TAYLOR the Socinian, with whom Mr. O. has associated Bishop WATSON and Dr. HEY. Now this circumstance, it is presumed, is nothing to the present purpose. The question is, does our Church furnish authority for such distinction? Should this be the case, it proves no more against the orthodoxy of it, that it was held by a *Socinian*; than it proves against the doctrine of the Trinity, that it is held by a *Romanist*.

Such a mode of introducing the subject, so evidently calculated to give a false bias to the reader's mind, is not more favourable to the investigation of truth, than it is creditable to the character of a Christian Divine. Mr. O. proceeds: "The *first* Justification they teach, is all that is attainable in

this life, and means ‘an admission into Christianity as a Christian Society,’ and belongs to all professed Christians without exception.” P. 179. To this the authority of Dr. HEY is added, who “uses the word Justification as synonymous with Baptism.” “This,” continues Mr. O., “is the express doctrine of Mr. DAUBENY.” P. 180. That Justification, in the sense in which it was occasionally used by our Reformers, is synonymous with Baptism, is certainly the doctrine of Mr. DAUBENY. The apparent objection of Mr. O., instead of inducing me to alter my language on this head, leads me rather to add to its strength. Instead of saying, therefore, as Mr. O. supposes, that by the *first* Justification is meant only “our admission into Christianity or a Christian society;” I say more, that by it is to be understood the actual salvation of the baptized party. Such is the language of our Reformers, such is the doctrine of the Church of England, and such was the doctrine of the Primitive Church. The blessed Apostle, (says St. CYPRIAN) manifestly proves, that it is *Baptism*, in which the old man dies, and the new man is born; where he says, “He hath *saved* us by the washing of regeneration.”\* St. AUSTIN speaking of Baptism says, “the water exhibits externally the sacrament of grace; and the Spirit ope-

\* Baptisma enim esse in quo homo vetus moritur & novus nascitur, manifestat & probat beatus Apostolus, dicens, *servavit nos per lavacrum regenerationis.*—Cyprian, Ep. 74, p. 140.

rates internally the benefit of that grace, loosing the chain of sin, and reconciling man's fallen nature in ADAM to GOD, by the regeneration of it in CHRIST.\* "Which grace, consisting in the remission of sin, and placing the baptized party in a state of justification before GOD, conferred by the sacrament of Baptism, the infant does not lose, as it has been already observed,† till he is of an age to become responsible for his *own proper sins*." c. 24. Hence St. BASIL, viewing the sacrament of Baptism in this important light, calls it "the beginning of life to him, and considers the day of his regeneration to be to him the first of days."‡

In conformity with this primitive doctrine, the words *baptized* and *justified* were considered by our Reformers to be *synonymous*. In the Homily on salvation, we are told, that "our office is not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly, after we are *baptized or justified*. Mr. O. is, very properly, a strong advocate for the *literal* sense of our Articles, and fails not to adduce the authority of our Reformers, when their *language* appears to suit his purpose. But on the present occasion that

\* "Aqua igitur exhibens forinsecus *sacramentum* gratiæ, et Spiritus operans intrinsecus *beneficium* gratiæ, *solvens vinculum* culpæ, reconcilians bonum naturæ, regenerant hominem in uno CHRISTO, ex uno ADAMO generatum." Augustin. Epist. ad Bonif. 98. p. 264.

† See page 180.

‡ "Ἀρχὴ μοι ζωῆς τὸ βάπτισμα, καὶ πρώτη ἡμερὰ ἐκείνη ἣ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας ἡμέρα." Basil. de Spir. Sanct. c. x. p. 22.



language; it seems, should have no weight, and for the following reason. "Dr. HEY had observed, that the word justification, as synonymous with baptism, is seldom if ever used in this sense, except in our Article and Homily." Admitting Dr. HEY's observation to be just, is not the evidence from our Articles and Homilies, that *very* legitimate evidence by which Mr. O. *professes* to ascertain what is the doctrine of our Church? Should the word *justification*, therefore, in that sense be used no where else, still, if it be *so* found in our Article and Homily, it is all the evidence that is required in this case, and must be of equal validity with any other evidence drawn from the same fountain. In short, evidence drawn from this fountain must either be admitted generally, or not at all. But Mr. O. thinks, that the circumstance of the word *justification*, in the sense under consideration, not being to be found any where, "except in our Article and Homily, renders it highly improbable that it is so used there. Does it not," says he, "far more than outweigh the single expression *baptized or justified* in the Homily?" P. 180. This appears to be strange reasoning. For upon this principle, the Articles and Homilies, which are appealed to as the standard for the Church doctrine, are not to be received according to the letter, but according to the sense Mr. O. thinks proper to affix to them. When our Reformers to the word *baptized* immediately annex the word

*justified*, as an equivalent term, it is highly improbable, Mr. O. says, that they could mean any such thing, because those words are not to be found so connected elsewhere. Such is the state of Mr. O.'s reasoning; its force my reader will readily appreciate.

But Mr. O., though apparently unacquainted with the language of the Primitive Church on this subject, had he read the Homily on Salvation throughout, at the time he was writing this page of his book, must have seen that our Reformers, by connecting the two words "*baptized or justified*" as synonymous, really meant what they said; for in the beginning of this Homily they lay down this position, "that infants being baptized, and dying in their infancy, *are* by his sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made his children and inheritors of his kingdom of heaven." Children, then, by virtue of their baptism, were, in the judgment of our Reformers, actually *justified*; for they were thereby "washed from their sins, and brought to God's favour," which is in other words to say, they were placed in a state of *justification* before God.\*

\* The learned Vitringa has placed this subject in the same light. "Certè nemo neget, infantes capaces esse beneficii ἀφεσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, quod δικαιῶσιν, *justificationem* appellare solemus: est enim id beneficium externum et σχητικόν, quod in infantes ad Christi Jesu intercessionem, propter ejus υπακοήν, Spiritu Sancto pro illorum conversione et renovatione spondente (liceat hic humano more balbutire) conferri potest." Vitring. Obs. Sac. l. ii. c. vi. p. 338.

To be, "*baptized or justified*," consequently, in their case meant the same thing.

And that such is the judgment of the Church of England, is further evident from the decisive declaration subjoined to the baptismal service, in the following words:—"It is *certain*, by GOD's word, that children dying before they commit actual sin, are *undoubtedly saved*." And as a proof that *justification* and *salvation*, in their relation to the sacrament of baptism, were considered at the Reformation to be but two words for the same thing, the reference made in the 11th Article to the Homily of Justification—must apply to the Homily or "Sermon of the Salvation of Mankind;" because it is in that Homily that the doctrine of *justification* is fully handled, and there is no Homily, the title of which corresponds with that mentioned in the Article.

But what makes Mr. O.'s ideas on this subject appear not to be the most consistent is, that in p. 183, with the view of proving that "the justification which we receive of GOD's mercy, and CHRIST's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of GOD, for our perfect and full justification;" he adduces the following passage from the Homily on Salvation. "By this sacrifice we are washed from our sins, brought to GOD's favour, and made inheritors of his kingdom of heaven. This, our Church adds, 'is that justification or righteousness which St. PAUL speaketh of, when

he saith, no man is justified by the works of the law, but freely by faith in Jesus CHRIST." P. 183. If, then, this passage proves, in Mr. O.'s judgment, the *justification* of the party to whom it applies; certain it is, that, as it stands in the Homily from whence it is taken, it is applied to the case of *infants*; a circumstance which must immediately have struck the reader to be in direct contradiction to the supposed *non-justification* of infants; the point Mr. O. seems to have been labouring, had not Mr. O. contrived to leave out that part of the passage which determined its application. The whole passage in the Homily runs thus: "Inasmuch, that *infants* being baptized, and dying in their infancy, are by his sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made his children and inheritors of his kingdom of heaven."

If, then, according to the position Mr. O. appears to lay down in p. 181, baptism is to be considered only as "the bare admission into the Christian religion," and neither infants, nor persons *under age*, as justified by it; it follows, that the same words, which to Mr. O. furnish a proof of the justification of the persons to whom he applies them in p. 183, furnish to him, at the same time, no proof of the justification of the parties, to whom they were *originally applied by our Reformers*. Had the author of a "Guide to the Church" thus quoted, and thus

attempted to prove, he certainly would not have been started. But I pass on.

As our Reformers, then, and consequently our Church, consider Baptism and Justification to be *synonymous*, this justification therefore may properly be called our *first justification*. "Dr. HAY, however, (Mr. O. proceeds) allows that there are such beings as these nominal Christians, and that the 13th Article, which treats of works before justification, is chiefly intended for *nominal* Christians." Taking this apparently for granted, Mr. O. thus continues: "But if baptism, or the bare admission into the Christian religion, means the same as justification, what sense is there in this Article, or in the doctrine it maintains, as applicable to such persons? Can they who are already admitted into Christianity, do works before they are admitted into it? Or can almost any member of our Church, when almost universally they are admitted in their infancy, ever do such works?"

The Article in question will have its proper sense, when applied to its proper object. But if Mr. O., in consequence of his mistaking the true nature of baptism, will misapply it, the sense of Mr. O., not that of our Reformers, will be called in question. "The 13th Article applies," says Bishop PARRYMAN, "to all those who have not lived under the Gospel dispensation;" to those, consequently, who have not been admitted into the Church by baptism.

Mr. O.'s reasoning, therefore, in this case, stands on a false foundation, and is inapplicable to the subject of infant baptism, on which the authority of our Reformers was appealed to on this occasion.

By *nominal* Christians, are meant Christians in *name only*. But to prove Christians *to be such*, their actual character must be ascertained. But baptized persons are not *therefore nominal* Christians, they are *professed* Christians; and their profession is concluded to be valid to their advantage, till by subsequent conduct such advantage is lost. Such is the principle on which our Church service is constructed. By virtue of the profession made for infants by their sureties, they are *baptized or justified*, and consequently *saved*, should they die before they have any actual sin to answer for.

"But," continues Mr. O. in p. 181, "the notion that justification is synonymous to baptism, 'is overthrown by their own hypothesis;' namely, that it supposes 'men to do their part faithfully;' and that we are then only put into *a way* of being eternally happy, if all things go on well, but that we may lose our way." The hypothesis made use of on this occasion, Mr. O. should know to be that laid down for us in the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of our Church; the notion built upon it, therefore, in this case, is in no danger of being overthrown. By considering baptism in the light of "a bare admission into the Christian religion," (p. 180)

instead of the actual conveyance of the grace of justification to the baptized party, Mr. O. seems to have totally lost sight of the sense of the Church of England on this important subject. Baptism, our Article teaches us, is a *sacrament*, exhibiting one thing to the senses, and another to the understanding; and “it is not only a sign of a profession, but also a *sign of regeneration*, or new birth; whereby, as an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed.”—Art. 27. And the answer which the Catechumen is taught by our Church to give to the question, “what meanest thou by this word sacrament?” is this: “I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as *a means whereby we receive the same*, and a *pledge to assure us thereof*.” Baptism is not, then, what Mr. O. calls it, “a bare admission into the Christian religion,” (p. 180) but it is the actual conveyance of inestimable benefits; it is the outward mean ordained by CHRIST, for the assurance of justification to the baptized party, placing him in a state of salvation, in which should he die, he will certainly be saved. Upon this principle all baptized infants, dying in that state, are saved; whilst the salvation of those who arrive at an age of *self-responsibility*, will depend on their con-

tinuance in that state of salvation in which by baptism they were placed. With this view the Catechumen, after "thanking God for calling him to this state of salvation by baptism, is taught by the Church "to pray unto God that he may *continue* in the same to his life's end."—See Catechism. Such is the doctrine of our Church, such was the sentiment of our Reformers on this subject; who held the doctrine of *assurance* of salvation, only so far as infants, dying in their infancy, were concerned; whilst, in all other cases, they considered baptism as the conveyance of benefits subject to contingency, as an admission into a state of salvation, which might afterwards be lost. And that salvation once in possession might again be lost, our Reformers teach the readers of the Homily on Good Works, in their observation on the case of the penitent thief; who, "if he had lived, and not regarded faith, and the works thereof, should," they say, "have lost his salvation again." "But," proceeds Mr. O., "if this mean, that we may lose our justification, and Dr. HEN speaks 'of our being restored to it,' then if justification be the same as baptism, in order to regain it, we must be *re-baptized*." P. 181.

This may be plausible reasoning, and may impose perhaps upon some readers, but its fallacy is easily exposed. For though justification, considered as the immediate and certain effect of baptism rightly administered, may on that account be said to be the



same as baptism, because every one rightly baptized is consequently *justified*; still it does not follow from hence, that in cases where the effect of baptism may be lost by subsequent misconduct, the repetition of the sacrament becomes necessary to the party; unless it can be proved, that the recovery of such effect has been provided for in no other way. The Primitive Church saw no difficulty in this subject. And had Mr. O. been as well acquainted with the writings only of St. AUSTIN, as from some parts of his publication his readers may suppose him to be, he certainly would not have committed himself upon it as he has done. To what St. AUSTIN says, relative to the infant not losing the grace once received by baptism, unless by his own *proper* impiety, on his arrival at the age of self-responsibility, he immediately adds, then he will begin to have his *own proper* sins, which should not be taken away by *regeneration*, (i. e. by a repetition of the sacrament which conveyed it) but should be cured in another way. "*Tunc enim etiam propria incipiet habere peccata, quæ non regeneratione auferantur, sed aliâ curatione sanentur.*"—August. *ad Bonif. Epist.* 98, p. 264. In conformity with which notion, which generally prevailed on this subject, St. AUSTIN elsewhere writes thus\*—"I am already born of

\* "Jam natus sum de ADAMO, non me potest iterum generare ADAM; jam natus sum de CHRISTO, non me potest iterum generare CHRISTUS. Quomodo iterum non potest repeti, sic nec Baptismus."—Augustin in Johan. Tract. xi. p. 378.

ADAM, ADAM cannot beget me again. I am already born of CHRIST, CHRIST cannot beget me again. As my natural birth cannot be repeated, so neither can my spiritual birth by baptism be repeated;" and for the reason that is given in another part of this father's writings, "because the sanctity of baptism cannot be polluted; and Divine grace gives effect to its own sacrament, whether it be to the salvation of those who make a good use, or to the destruction of those who make a bad use of it."\* By which is to be understood, that though the saving effect of baptism may be lost *for the time being* to the baptized party, in consequence of sin, yet, as his *covenanted title* to that effect is not thereby lost, the sacrament which conveyed that title, requires not to be repeated. In this sense, the sacrament of baptism cannot be polluted, so as to become ineffectual to its intended object; because the consecrated party has it in his power to reinstate himself in his original title, by an adoption of the means pointed out to him, under the covenant which that sacrament confirms—namely, *repentance and renewed obedience*.

In this sense, then, though not in the sense in which it is used by some modern teachers, the maxim, "once regenerate and always regenerate," is a true

\* "Quia ipsa ejus (Baptismi) *sanctitas* pollui non potest, et *sacramento suo* *Divina* virtus adfuit, sive ad *salutem* bene utentium, sive ad *perniciem* male utentium."—Augustin de Bapt. l. iii. c. x. p. 113.

maxim in Christianity, and was an established one in the Primitive Church.

But to meet Mr. O. on the ground he has taken. To the sentiments of our Reformers Mr. O. generally appeals, to justify his condemnation of the divines upon whom he sits in judgment. Dr. HEN and myself are charged, at least, with an absurdity, in supposing that persons once put into a way of salvation may lose that way; and on the other hand, that justification once lost is to be regained. It has been already seen, from the authority of our Reformers, that in their judgment a man might lose his salvation, if after the attainment of it “he regarded not faith and the works thereof.” And were Mr. O. fully acquainted with the writings of the Reformers, he would know that the difficulty here started, respecting the recovery of lost justification, has been thus simply provided for by them; for after delivering their judgment on the case of infants dying in their infancy, they proceed thus:—“And they which in act or deed do sin *after* their baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by his sacrifice from their sins, in such sort, that there remaineth not any spot of sin, that shall be imputed to their damnation. This is that *justification* or righteousness which St. PAUL speaketh of, when he saith, “no man is justified by the works of the law, but freely by faith in Jesus CHRIST.”\*

\* Hemily on Salvation.

Such was the judgment of our Reformers, in agreement with what has been already seen to be the judgment of the Primitive Church on this subject. But Mr. O. thinks, that if justification is the same as baptism, which our Reformers have in other words declared it to be; in the case where justification is lost, to regain it, the party must necessarily be *re-baptized*. “*Eò disconvenit.*”

Indeed had Mr. O. attended to the proper nature of baptism, that it has succeeded to circumcision, and is, what that was, the seal of a covenant, a sign of a thing signified, and the assurance of a spiritual benefit actually conveyed, it might have occurred to him, that there was ~~no~~ more necessity for the continued repetition of the sign, in the case of the baptized Christian, than there was in that of the circumcised Jew; had not the absolute impossibility of the repetition of the sign in the case of the Jew totally superseded all reasoning on the subject. In conformity with the notion respecting the necessity of *re-baptism*, for the recovery of lost justification; a notion which originates in the confusion of those two distinct subjects, *regeneration* and *renovation*; to the absolution which succeeds to the confession of the faithful penitent, the Church should have added the form of baptism, as necessary to the recovery of the sinner's lost state. All arrived at age of maturity being considered to be more or less sinners; every time, consequently, that a sinner, by his con-

session, acknowledges his breach of the baptismal covenant, he must, according to Mr. O.'s principle, to regain the justification conveyed by that covenant, be *re-baptized*. But my reader has only to follow Mr. O. one page further, and if I mistake not, he will find him building up what he had just been employed in pulling down. For after having written decidedly against the doctrine of the Reformers in p. 181, Mr. O., at the top of p. 182, makes use of the very authority which he had been just rejecting, to prove, in the words of our Reformers, that "they who in act or deed sin after baptism, are washed by CHRIST'S sacrifice from their sins," or obtain this blessing of justification, "when they turn again to God unfeignedly."

This argument against re-baptism may be considered as not strictly relevant, in its application to Mr. O.; his own argument against the supposed synonymous use of the words, "*baptized or justified*," being apparently grounded on the *admitted* absurdity of re-baptism, which he weakly contends would be the consequence necessarily resulting from such supposition. In justice to our Church, however, it was proper, in a general view, that the subject should be thus fully stated; that my reader may see how completely the language of the Reformers is secured from that *imaginary* absurdity, to which Mr. O. has made it obnoxious.

But we will read Mr. O. in his own letter. In p. 180, where mention is made of the expression of our Reformers in the Homily on salvation, respecting infants where they are said to be "*baptized or justified*;" Mr. O. considers it to be highly improbable that such expression was meant to convey the idea of baptism and justification being synonymous. But in p. 182 Mr. O. says, that "sinners, who in act or deed sin after baptism, are washed by CHRIST's sacrifice from their sins, or *obtain this blessing of justification*, when they turn again to God unfeignedly;" that is, they are not washed over again, but they thereby recover the benefit or effect of their baptismal washing, that of being "washed by CHRIST's sacrifice from their sins." Such are the words made use of by our Reformers, as descriptive of the effect of baptism. After quoting these words in their application to the sinner, Mr. O. adds to them his own explanation. "Sinners are washed by CHRIST's sacrifice from their sins," or, as he proceeds, "*obtain this blessing of justification*." According to his own judgment, then, as it is to be met with in p. 182, the being washed by CHRIST's sacrifice from sin by baptism, and the obtaining the blessing of justification, mean, in effect, the same thing; therefore, the expressions "*baptized or justified*," as applied by our Reformers to the case of infants, were *synonymous*.

It is with reluctance that I detain my reader longer on this subject; but Mr. O.'s general language upon it appears to correspond so little with the doctrine of our Church, that no part of it should be passed by unnoticed.

Mr. O., with the view of still strengthening the ground he has been attempting to establish, relative to baptism being "the bare admission into the Christian religion," p. 180, not the mean of *justification to the party*, proceeds thus:—"Even the passage quoted from their favourite, though illegitimate authority, the 'Necessary Doctrine,' &c. is nothing to their purpose. The passage produced from the 'Necessary Doctrine,' in p. 183 of the Appendix, he observes, 'only mentions baptism as the way by which God hath determined that man *being of age*, and coming to Christendom, should be justified.' But," continues he, "it certainly does not hence follow, that it is the way by which those who are *not of age*, and, therefore, not capable of faith and repentance, are justified." P. 181. True; if our judgment on this subject is to be definitively settled by the letter of one insulated passage, taken from what Mr. O. calls *illegitimate* authority, it certainly does not. But if from this passage we appeal to another, taken from what Mr. O. himself must allow to be *legitimate* authority, which speaks of *infants* as "*baptized or justified*,"\* by taking these two passages together, as the production of the same writers, it will appear

\* Homily on Salvation.

to have been the opinion of our Reformers, that baptism, at what time soever administered, was the appointed means by which justification was conveyed to the party. To which judgment our Church has been conformed, by the accommodation of the baptismal service to the case both of *infants* and *adults*.

The objection Mr. O. appears to make to the *justification* of infants by baptism, because they "*are not capable of faith and repentance*," I leave to be answered by the Catechumen, when Mr. O., in his next course of Catechetical Lectures, shall put to him the following question:—"Why, then, are infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them?"

Mr. O., indeed, in the opening of this Chapter, prepared his reader for what he had to expect from him on this subject, by the following declaration: "*Our views of this particular (justification) are fully expressed by Archbishop CRANMER, in his Discourse of Justification, on reviewing 'the Eru-dition of a Christian Man.'* *To be justified*, this Prelate here shews, is to 'have the forgiveness of our sins, to be reconciled to God, to be accepted and reputed just and righteous in his sight.' "And," proceeds Mr. O., "omitting altogether subjects who are incapable of faith, this, we conceive, is effected, *when a man rightly believes.*" P. 179.\*

\* My reader (as he passes on) will here remark, that Mr. O. considers a quotation made by himself from CRANMER's Discourse



The two succeeding pages of this Chapter are calculated to leave this conclusion on the reader's mind, that infants, considered as "subjects incapable of faith," are on that account not justified by baptism. Such appears to be the judgment of Mr. O. on this subject. But the Primitive Church, our Reformers, and the Church of England, as it has been seen, have otherwise determined. Whereas Mr. O.'s notion of baptism appears to correspond, in a degree at least, with what the editors of the *Christian Observer* have given in their number for July 1802, in the following words:—"Baptism is *only* the outward sign of an admission into the Church, administered by fallible men, and may or may not be accompanied by the inward and spiritual grace of justification, which is the act of God alone." Justification is not less the act of God, because it is conveyed by outward and visible means, and through the instrumentality of fallible men; the only question on this subject is, whether God has been pleased to appoint such a method of conveying it. Our Blessed SAVIOUR declared, "He that believeth and is baptized, *shall be saved.*" Now salvation is the gift of

on reviewing 'the Erudition of a Christian Man,' to be *good authority* for the point he has to substantiate; but when a quotation is made by me from the *work itself*, which was chiefly composed under CRANMER's direction, it then becomes *illegitimate testimony*; the work being among the productions of HENRY the VIIIth's time, and on that account not proper for the illustration of our Church doctrine.—See *Overton*, p. 56, 68.

GOD through CHRIST. He has been pleased, however, to suspend this gift, on certain conditions, by annexing it to the profession of faith and the use of certain appointed means. On this account CHRIST instituted the ordinance of baptism, and delivered a commission to his Apostles for its administration; concluding with assuring them, that his Spirit should be with them in the discharge of their commission always, to the end of the world. It might be supposed, that no doubt could remain with respect to the validity of an ordinance thus instituted, when regularly administered. Mr. O., however, and the editors of the *Christian Observer*, in *direct contradiction* to the express doctrine of our Church, think—*the former*, that persons *under age* cannot be justified by baptism; *the latter*, that the inward and spiritual grace *may* or *may not* accompany the outward and visible sign in baptism; whilst both, with the 25th and 27th Articles, as it were, staring them in the face, which tell them that “baptism is not only a sign of profession, but also a sign of regeneration, by which, as by an instrument, the promises of God in CHRIST are visibly signed and sealed” to the baptized party, appear to be equally agreed in considering baptism as “only the outward sign of admission into the Church,” or, in Mr. O.’s words, “the bare admission into the Christian religion.”

But the *Christian Observer* has discovered, moreover, that baptism, being administered by *false*

men, may or may not be accompanied by the inward and spiritual grace of justification, which is the act of God alone. "Justification," say our Reformers, "is the office of God only, and is not a thing which we render unto Him, but which we receive from Him."—*Homily on Salvation*. But how, it may be asked, do men, whilst members of the Church on earth, receive it? Not *immediately* from God; for God is not visibly present with his Church; but *mediately* through the faithful use of means of grace appointed by Him for the purpose, and by the instrumentality of his deputed ministers. Now these ministers have been fallible men from the beginning, and will be so to the end. ST. PAUL, speaking of the ministry, says, 'we have this treasure in *earthen vessels*,' and for this important reason, 'that the excellency of the power (of the Gospel committed to us) may be *of God*, and not *of us*.' 2 Cor. iv. 7. Our Reformers were equally sensible of human infirmity; but it never entered into their heads, that the *fallibility* of the men did in any respect affect the validity of their commission, as 'stewards of the mysteries of God.' What their opinion was on this subject, the Christian Observer might have known from the 26th Article, which runs thus:—"Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the word and sacraments, yet, forasmuch as they

do not the same in *their own name*, but in CHRIST's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their ministry, &c. Neither is the effect of CHRIST's ordinance taken away by their *wickedness*, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the sacraments, which be effectual, because of CHRIST's institution and promise, although they be ministered by *evil men*, &c." *Art. 26*. It being a ruled case, then, that the absolute wickedness of the minister does not invalidate CHRIST's ordinance, his fallibility, as a man, must *a fortiori* be considered as throwing no impediment in the way of his ministry. In fact, this doctrine of the infallibility of the man invalidating the office of the minister, may suit a Church (if any Christian society of man's forming can properly be so called) which discards the Christian priesthood, but certainly does not belong to a Church built upon the Apostolic foundation, as that of England is. And, indeed, to what do these *heretical* positions of Mr. O., and of the Christian Observer, relative to the inefficacy of baptism, as a spiritual ordinance, lead, but, to one or other of the following blasphemous conclusions;—either that our Blessed SAVIOUR, in the Sacrament of Baptism, engaged to grant that grace of justification, which, at the same time it was not meant that the baptized party should receive; or, that he instituted means inadequate to convey it.

Were Mr. O. an uniformly consistent advocate for the letter of our Articles, and had the divines on whom he sits in judgment, committed themselves, as he has done on the subject of Baptism; he certainly (if we may judge from the usually unqualified manner in which his charges are advanced) would not have considered this degradation of a sacrament into "a mere outward sign," this conversion of the seal of a Divine covenant, and the pledge of justification to the party, into "a bare admission into the Christian religion," or as Mr. O. might have called it, "the mere entering the child's name in the Church Register," as an attempt to evade or extenuate the meaning of our Articles; but would have unequivocally described it by its *proper* title, as *downtright* *heresy*; the distinctive character of which consists in the private opinion of an individual being set up, in opposition to the established doctrine of the Church. Sorry am I to think, that such erroneous opinions, relative to a sacrament of our Church, should constitute part of that new system of divinity, now industriously circulated by those of our Clergy, who, in their zeal for the honour of God, seem to be attempting to reform upon the Reformation. A species of divinity suited to self-constituted Ministers, who know no commission but that of their own *assuming*; but certainly unsuited to the character of Clergy, who have a Divine commission to *produce* for the office they undertake.

At a time when the nature of the Christian Church, together with the office of its priesthood, seems, alas! to be fast wearing out of knowledge, I shall be excused, I trust, for detaining my reader a few moments longer on this important subject. A *visible* Church must have *visible* means of grace, and *visible* ministers to apply them. And no other Church seems calculated for man's condition in this world. These visible ministers, though fallible men in themselves, are infallible when regularly acting, as representatives of God, in the discharge of their appointed commission; otherwise they would not be properly what St. PAUL calls them, "ambassadors for CHRIST." GROTIUS, though no bigotted friend to the priesthood; speaking of the priest, thus comments on the 1st v. of the 5th chap. to the Hebrews:—"Erat ejus officium DEI vice apud populum fungi; et populi vice apud DEUM fungi." It was the priest's office to be on God's part to the people, and on the part of the people to God. The words here used by St. PAUL, τα πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, rendered in our version, "in things pertaining to God," are clearly taken from the direction given by JETHRO to MOSES, as it is to be met with in the Septuagint translation, —Γινε σὺ τὰ λαῶν τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. "Be thou for the people to Godward." In other versions, "Be thou to the people before God, or in the presence of God; or be thou to the people (a parte DEI) on God's part;" or as in the

vulgar Latin translation, "*Esto tu populo in his, que ad DEUM pertinent.* Be thou to the people in things pertaining to God." And it is by virtue of a similar mediatory character, in which the priest, under the Gospel dispensation, stands between God and the people, that the sacraments, according to the principle on which the Evangelical commission proceeds, become sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, actually conveyed to every qualified party. (See Article 25th.) And hence it follows, that in the faithful use of these appointed means, according to the established œconomy of CHRIST'S Church on earth, the grace of God is ordinarily to be received.

To depreciate, therefore, the sacraments of the Church, on the score of the fallibility of the minister, whose office it is to dispense them; and thereby to lead serious people to look for immediate communications from Heaven, which they will not fail to do, if they are taught that the fallibility of the minister may prevent their receiving benefit from their ministry; is to set aside the plan on which CHRIST thought fit, that the affairs of his kingdom should be transacted; an effect, which, if not counteracted, must ultimately terminate in the annihilation of CHRIST'S visible Church on earth. The position, that baptized persons *may* or *may not* be justified, certainly corresponds with the Calvinistic doctrine of Election, according to which, Justification is the exclusive portion of certain chosen individuals;

in which case, it must be admitted, that the sacrament of baptism can make no alteration in the case of parties, whose condition had been previously and irrecoverably determined. This may be sound doctrine with divines of the Genevan school; but certainly it bears no affinity to that of the Church of England; which, after the example of her Divine Head, is no respecter of persons in this case. All properly admitted within her pale by baptism are considered to be (in the words of her service) "in the number of God's faithful and elect children;" in the same sense in which the members of the several Churches collected by the Apostles, are styled the "*faithful in CHRIST JESUS*," and "*elect of God*." Like them they are by Divine grace *elect*ed to the privileges of the Gospel covenant. They are consequently placed in a state of *present* salvation; and must, therefore, for *the time being*, be justified. And neither our Reformers knew, nor does our Church know, any other justification, but that originally conveyed by the sacrament of baptism; which, when lost, as it is continually liable to be by the subsequent conduct of the party, is, through grace, to be recovered by the same means which qualified for its original possession; namely, repentance and faith, accompanied with renewed obedience.

At the same time it shall be readily admitted, that if the object Mr. O. had in view on this occasion, was simply to guard against the abuse of sacraments,



considered as the mere *opus operatum* of the Christian ministry, no one will more cordially join issue with him than myself. But it must be remembered, that to correct a faulty superstructure, and to pull up the foundation of a building, are two very different things. The language made use of by Mr. O. and the Christian Observer on the present subject, must put erroneous notions into the heads of well-meaning uninformed persons, being calculated to introduce a spurious system in the place of that sound divinity of our Reformers, by which Christians, if not wanting to themselves, may become wise unto salvation; against which, at a time when our excellent Church seems to be marked out for more than common trial, by the licentious practice and presumptuous ignorance of enthusiasts and schismatics of every description, the honest minister of CHRIST is imperiously called upon to bear his most decided testimony.

To proceed: "It is common (Mr. O. says) to represent faith, as strictly implying no more than *an assent to the truth of Christianity*; or as Mr. BENSON expresses it, an allowance that Jesus is the Messiah; or, according to Mr. DAUBENY, such a faith as St. JAMES mentions. "St. JAMES has always appeared to me," Mr. DAUBENY says, "to speak, not of a man who merely says he has faith, but a faith *unavailable to salvation*, in consequence of its being unaccompanied with its corresponding effects."

P, 199. "This, then," Mr. O. concludes, "is supposed (by his opponents) to be the faith that is required, and all that is supposed to be wanting is *works*."

Thus Mr. O. reasons for his opponents. Mr. O.'s opponents shall now reason for themselves; for I think I may venture to be their mouth-piece on this occasion. When any of the divines to whom Mr. O. alludes, speak of faith, as implying an assent to the truth of Christianity, they speak of it only according to the simple definition of that word; but not in that complex sense, in which faith, as one of the Christian graces, can be available to salvation. When Mr. DAUBENY appealed to St. JAMES as speaking not of a man who merely says he has faith and has it not, but of one who actually *professes faith*, but a faith unavailable to salvation; he must be understood to have done it, with the view of pointing out the line of discrimination which St. JAMES thought necessary to be drawn between *professional* and *practical* faith; between that faith which is figuratively called "dead faith," because, on account of its unproductiveness, it is no better than dead, and the faith "*made perfect by works*;" for the purpose of condemning the one, and establishing the other. And that my object, which was that of guarding against the *unqualified* use of the term *faith*, could not be mistaken, it might be fairly concluded after attending to the following passage, in the page

immediately succeeding :—" It is true, faith is often represented in scripture as the completion of the Christian plan of salvation ; and so, when taken in its full and finished state, as "*made perfect by works*," according to St. JAMES's description of it, it certainly is. But we are *now guarding against a mistake*, to which an *unqualified* use of this term often leads." Guide, p. 302. But Mr. O., making the divines, against whom he is writing, talk nonsense, whether they will or not, has found out that, because Mr. D. makes mention of a species of faith which is *unavailable* to salvation, for the express purpose of condemning it, therefore such is the faith that Mr. D. is supposed to require. But as the fundamental position, in which Mr. D. agrees with Mr. O., could not have escaped his knowledge, because it occurs in the page but one preceding, and is to the following effect—that we are to be saved only "through faith by the all-sufficient merits of a crucified Redeemer;" it follows, that the faith above alluded to by Mr. D. as *unavailable to salvation*, cannot possibly be the faith he requires. Mr. O., however, *supposes it so to be*, only that *works are wanting*. When *professional* faith, of which Mr. D. was speaking, changes its quality, and becomes productive of its proper fruits, it at the same time changes its title, and is called *practical* faith. And the essential difference between these two kinds of faith is this, that the one *is* available to salvation,

the other *is not*. Which of these two kinds of faith Mr. D. must be supposed to require, no reader of common understanding and moderate charity can need to be informed.

Mr. O. thus proceeds:—"When, therefore, we are said to be justified by faith, and by *faith only*, these divines say, that in this case faith signifies 'obedience to the whole religion of CHRIST, including both belief and practice;' or as they at other times express it, 'the complex of all Christianity;' or in Mr. DAUBENY's language, 'faith in the *concrete*,' faith as comprehensive of all Christian duties. And this faith *justifies*, they say, not as it unites us to CHRIST, or is the *instrument* through which we apply his merits to ourselves, or as it complies with the precept of relying on CHRIST's merits for justification, but as it thus "implies *true holiness in the nature of it*, &c." Most of the disputes that have taken place on this much-controverted subject, have originated more, perhaps, from difference of expression, than from difference of opinion in the parties concerned in them. At the same time, while the faculties and comprehensions of men are so weak and various, it is not to be expected, that all writers should see any subject exactly in the same light; much less that their ideas of it should be clothed precisely in the same dress: Consequently, all that is to be hoped for is, that the grounds of unavoidable differences should be reduced into as

narrow a compass as possible ; and this would in a great degree be effected, if all those disputes which turn merely upon words, to which the parties have not annexed, and in some cases are not able to annex, clear and precise ideas, were removed. When, therefore, persons may be supposed to agree in the *essential* part of any subject, it is but a waste of time, often at a great expence of charity, to cavil and dispute about words. "But contenders," say our Reformers, "will ever forge matters of contention, even when they have none occasion thereto. Notwithstanding such be the less to be passed upon, so that the rest may profit, which will be the most desirous to know the truth, than, when it is plain enough, to contend about it, and with contentious and capacious cavillation to obscure and darken it."\*

The object Mr. O. appears to have in view in p. 191, is to prove that the divines, against whom he is writing, hold opinions very discordant from those notions of faith, which are recognized by the ministers whose cause he advocates. These notions of faith are described in p. 188, as consisting in "a cordial belief of God's testimony, and a reliance on his promises." But does it follow, that Bishop PRETTYMAN, BURNET, and the author of the "Guide to the Church," the writers here alluded to, do not possess "a cordial belief of God's testimony, and a firm reliance on his promises," because,

\* Homily on Salvation, p. 17.

in speaking of that faith which is available to salvation, they do not describe it in precisely the same language, that Mr. O. or his brother Calvinists adopt for the purpose? This, indeed, would be not only to make the Calvinistic creed the standard for orthodoxy, but the Calvinistic writings also a standard for correct language, to which distinction they certainly have not the best pretensions.

Bishop BULL, one of the most learned divines, as well as one of the most conclusive reasoners that the Church has to boast, objected to the description of faith, as the *instrument* by which we apply the merits of CHRIST; and it was a word which Bishop BURNET also considered to be improperly applied to the subject. Here, then, are three Bishops, with whom the great body of the English clergy will be found to agree on this point, whose language does not come up to Mr. O.'s standard. This, however, it shall be admitted, is not proof. But the substance of what the divines in question have said on the subject of faith, prove, that they wanted no information upon it; and it was not necessary for Mr. O., by way of contrast to their supposed erroneous opinions, to inform his readers what the Church teaches on this subject, because these divines teach the same; the only fault being in Mr. O., who appears slow to comprehend, in this case, what is certainly most easy to be understood. And though Mr. O. may turn this subject backward and forward, till he has

worn it threadbare, as he appears to have done in this Chapter, still, after all, he can say no more upon it than what may be said in two sentences, and in which all sound members of the Church must agree, namely, that the faith available to salvation through CHRIST is not a mere professional faith, but a faith productive of its proper effects. And when we are said to be saved by *faith alone*, the expression is to be understood, by faith in opposition to works, though this faith doth not of itself justify; for "justification is the office of God only, and JESUS CHRIST the sole meritorious cause of it." In this respect, faith and good works stand on an equal footing, both being "shut out from the office of justifying;"\* at the same time both are necessary to be present in the justified party, as qualifications, without which he will not be justified.

I was in hopes, both for my own sake and for my reader's, that I had dispatched this truly tedious Chapter. But in passing on, my name occurs again in p. 199, where Mr. O., speaking of our Article, which says, "we are saved by *faith*," proceeds thus: "This is," adds some Dr. CROFT, or Mr. DAUBENY, "*by faith and works together.*" The short passage here printed in italics, and marked as a quotation, is no where to be found in my writings. For the reader's satisfaction, however, I subjoin two passages that immediately occur, which, among others to the

\* Homily on Salvation.

same effect, are to be found in them. In the 314th page of the Guide, the author writes thus:—"In a word, that man is not to be saved by any works of righteousness of his own, because, in consequence of their imperfection, they can have no merit in the eyes of GOD, but by what JESUS CHRIST has done and suffered for him, is a doctrine which cannot be too unequivocally expressed." "Properly speaking," I say, "the justification of man is the gracious act of GOD alone, through JESUS CHRIST."\* The reader shall now be left to determine the degree of credit due to the assertions of Mr. OVERTON.

Many pages are here taken up by Mr. O., for the apparent purpose of instructing the divines, against whom he writes, in the sense in which our Reformers are to be understood, when they say, that we are saved "without works by faith only;" whilst several specimens in Mr. O.'s publication lead to the conclusion, that the divines in question understand the language of our Reformers better than he himself does; and *because* they do not see that language through a *Calvinistic* medium. Our Reformers certainly never meant to say that we were saved *without works*, in the sense in which Mr. O. appears to understand them. The object they had in view, in their Homily on Salvation, was completely to vindicate the meritorious office of CHRIST from all possible encroachment by the Romish doctrine of

\* Appendix, p. 177.



human merit ; they therefore multiplied words for the purpose of establishing, by every mode of expression of which they judged the subject capable, these two essential positions—that human works of every kind were totally excluded from the office of justification; and that “CHRIST himself only was the *meritorious* cause thereof.”\* When therefore Mr. O., in p. 207, adduces the testimony of Bishop HORSLEY, in the following words, “that man is justified by faith without the works of the law, was the uniform doctrine of the first Reformers;” and to this testimony adds the evidence of Bishop WASSERTON to the same effect, namely, that “redemption by CHRIST, together with its consequent doctrine of justification by faith alone, were the great Gospel principles on which *Protestantism* was founded;” the reader who knows the ground on which Protestantism was originally built, must see, that Mr. O. is here adducing authorities, which do not in the least apply against those divines, who perfectly agree in doctrine with our Reformers, by excluding works from the office of justifying.

It is with concern that I proceed to notice something in p. 211, because it does not appear to Mr. O.’s credit. In p. 210 Mr. O. opens his attack on a part of my writings by the following observation, which, if true, would certainly be important:—“But,” says he, speaking of his opponents, “neither are

\* Homily on Salvation, p. 18.

these divines Protestants enough to exclude our own merits, in this matter of our justification before God. Mr. D., although on some occasions he *verbally* disclaims it, is justly chargeable with the same doctrine." As this charge bears hard on my professional character, it is to be expected that it should be fully proved. But before we enter on the proof, it may be asked, how far it is consistent with that rule of justice, by which Mr. O., in his preface, professed to conduct his publication, to charge a writer with an opinion, which he *verbally*, I may add, *repeatedly* and unequivocally disclaims? It has always been considered, that when an honest man *verbally disclaims* any thing, he really means to disclaim it. To charge him, therefore, on a serious and important subject, with what he *verbally* disclaims, is in other words to say, that he is not an honest man. Mr. O. should know, that two of the characteristic properties of Christian charity are, that it "believeth all things, and hopeth all things;" not against probability, nor against hope, but that it believeth and hopeth the best, when there is no compulsory reason to enforce the contrary persuasion. Let us now examine the reason Mr. O. has in this case produced, to warrant his departure from this Christian rule of judgment.

Mr. D., then, is here charged with not excluding *human merit* in the matter of justification. "For," (says Mr. O.) Mr. D. produces a passage from the

‘Erudition of a Christian Man,’ which says expressly, that good works are *meritorious* towards the attaining of everlasting life.” P. 210. If the reader will now refer to p. 328 of the Appendix, he will find, indeed, that Mr. D. does quote this passage from the “Erudition of a Christian man,” but only as the sentiment of *our Reformers*. His *own sentiment* on the subject is to be found at large in the same page immediately preceding the extract. Speaking of the power vouchsafed to man under the Gospel Covenant, to do works “pleasing and acceptable to God,” I proceed thus:—“I do not say, Sir, that these works will be the *meritorious* cause of his salvation, or such works as set up a claim to eternal life; but, that they will be considerations on account of which God will be pleased to accept a fallen, condemned, though, at the same time, repentant and obedient sinner, for the sake of what an All-Gracious SAVIOUR has done and suffered for him.”

Having delivered this as my *own sentiment*, by way of proving *a fortiori* that it was not too strong, I continue thus:—“Our Reformers, if I mistake in not, ‘the Erudition of a Christian Man,’ spake still more strongly on this point, when, under the article ‘*Good Works*,’ they say, ‘forasmuch as they be done *in the faith of CHRIST*, and by the virtue and merits of his passion, &c. they be the very service of God, and *meritorious* towards the attainment of everlasting life.” In the passage here taken from

the "Erudition of a Christian Man," *good works* and the word *meritorious* are, it is true, in some sense, placed in *connection*. Whereas, in the passage expressive of my own sentiment on this subject, the two words *works* and *meritorious* are *so* placed in connection, as to convey an idea the *very opposite* to that, with which the passage brought forward by Mr. O. is *by him* made chargeable. The reason why, in the process of his proof, Mr. O. has substituted the language of the Reformers for my own; thus making them speak for me, instead of suffering me to speak for myself, is not necessary to be pointed out.

But taking this passage, as it stands in its place; to infer what Mr. O. does from it, relative to the merit of good works, in that *erroneous* sense in which alone the passage can be objectionable, proves Mr. O. to be more frightened by the sound of words than attentive to the meaning of them, on this occasion: for to suppose, that our Reformers meant that good works were in themselves the *meritorious* cause of man's justification, is to suppose that they directly contradicted themselves; their generally-declared doctrine being this—that "*CHRIST himself only* was the meritorious cause thereof."\* In justice, therefore, to our Reformers, common candour would conclude, that the word *meritorious*, as here used, could mean only that works done in the faith of CHRIST were *meritorious*, *comparatively* with

\* Homily on Salvation.

other works not done on the same principle ; that is, they had a degree of merit, in God's eye, derived to them from their relation to CHRIST ; in the words of our Article, they " were pleasing and acceptable to God *in CHRIST*," " in whom (as our Reformers express themselves in language very similar to that just made use of) every true Christian may be called a fulfiller of the law, forasmuch as that which their infirmity lacked, CHRIST's justice hath supplied." \* Possibly, had our Reformers foreseen that their writings were to pass through a Calvinistic ordeal, they might, with the view of guarding against all possibility of misrepresentation, have substituted for the word *meritorious*, the less ambiguous one *available*. Thus much for the first proof. Proceed we now to the second.

Speaking of Mr. DAUBENY, Mr. O. thus proceeds, p. 210 :—" He talks of works, obedience to the moral law, as constituting men ' relatively worthy,' and giving them, as he explains the latter of these scriptures, *Rev. xxii. 14*, a right of grace, on the part of God, to the tree of life, and of God becoming their debtor." This *right of grace*, on the part of God, to minister to Mr. O.'s proof, must be converted into a *right of merit* on the part of man. For this purpose Mr. O. thus continues :—" A right of grace, and God man's debtor, in consequence of his obedience to the moral law ! for this

\* Homily on Salvation, p. 15.

is what Mr. D. is enforcing. This surely is strange, if not utterly incomprehensible doctrine!" P. 211.

It surely is not strange doctrine, but to those who are strangers to their Bible; for there the doctrine is to be found in more places than one. "He that hath pity on the poor, *lendeth* unto the LORD, and look what he layeth out, it shall be paid him again." Prov. xix. According to this passage, taken from our Communion Service, GOD, in a figurative sense, becomes *man's debtor*; and still every communicant knows in what sense this text is to be received, and is not so little of a Protestant, as not to be satisfied that it gives no countenance to the corrupt doctrine of Popish merit. In the portion of scripture now under immediate consideration, He who is Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last, says thus:—"Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be. Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have *a right* to the tree of life." This Mr. O. calls "strange if not incomprehensible doctrine." But as this doctrine contains nothing *in itself* that is incomprehensible, the incomprehensibility of it must be attributed either to want of capacity or disposition in the party. But with the first of these defects no reader will be inclined to charge Mr. OVERTON.

The reference here made is to the 287, 288, and 289th pages of the "Guide." In the first and

second of these pages the following passages are found:—"They (the Clergy) look, generally speaking, to the cross as to fallen man's *only hope*, and *only title* to salvation. But it being the office of the Christian Ministry 'rightly to divide the word of truth,' the grand object they have before them is, *so* to preach the doctrine of the cross, that no erroneous conclusion may be drawn from it." "Hence it becomes necessary, that a proper distinction should be made between the works of the law, considered as making any part of man's *title* to salvation, and those works which are required to be performed under the Gospel. Whoever sees works in the former light (namely, as making any part of man's *title* to salvation) is what the Judaizing Christian was in St. PAUL's day, he is going about to 'establish his own righteousness, not submitting himself to the righteousness of God.' But if works are weighed in their proper scale, not as man's *title* to salvation, but his *qualification* for it, upon the Gospel axiom, that "without holiness no man shall see the LORD," it appears to be of essential importance, that they should be pressed upon Christians at all times as the *condition* upon which they are taught to look for salvation."

. From these passages the point Mr. O. has to substantiate derives no assistance; for so far from countenancing the idea, with which their author is made chargeable, relative to *human merit* having any thing to do with the office of justification, they

expressly maintain the very opposite doctrine. How, then, it may be asked, has the language of the author of the "Guide" been so misunderstood? Does the fault in this case lie with the *writer* or the *reader*? To determine this point, appeal must be made to the passage itself, which is to be found in p. 289, thus constructed. Speaking of those who "shall walk with Christ in white, for they are worthy," says CHRIST, Rev. iii. 4, I paraphrase thus—*Worthy*, not *absolutely* so in themselves, but *relatively* so; worthy, in that sense in which GOD, through CHRIST, graciously thinks fit to consider them. In this sense, "blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have *right* to the tree of life, and may enter into the city of God." Rev. xxii. 14. "A right of *grace on the part of God*, not of *merit on the part of man*; for that, we trust, is universally disclaimed." "*A right of grace on the part of God*," and "*not of merit on the part of man*," were passages here placed in designed opposition to each other, and marked in Italics, for the purpose of more readily attracting the reader's notice, and impressing on his mind the sense intended to be conveyed. Should Mr. O. be furnished with a satisfactory reason, why, in bringing forward a passage for making good a charge of false doctrine against me, he omitted that particular portion of it, which decidedly disclaims such a doctrine, it is for him to produce it.



But something still remains to be said on this subject. By *a right of grace on the part of God* is to be understood, a right founded on the covenant of grace. The covenant of grace is, on **God's** part, a covenant of *promise*. Now Mr. O. must possess a precision of ideas, sufficient to enable him to discriminate between a debt of *promise* and a debt of *service*; between a debt for which God, according to the tenor of the Evangelical covenant, makes himself responsible, and a debt which man challenges to be paid by God for service performed; otherwise he certainly is not the best qualified to manage the cause he has undertaken. On the supposition, then, that Mr. O. had bound himself under a most solemn promise, that, on the performance of certain conditions he would convey a certain benefit; would he not think, that the party performing the conditions had *a right* to look to him for the fulfilment of his obligation? And would he not consider himself to be, in a figurative sense, a debtor to that party, so far as his own promise had bound him? Now were I disposed to adopt Mr. O.'s language, I might here say to him, in the stile in which he so confidently addresses his opponents in p. 68 of his publication, "What, did Mr. O. never hear of St. AUSTIN?" I shall, however, take leave only to ask him this plain question; how has it come to pass, that Mr. O., in commenting on a page of my writings, has omitted to insert a passage

quoted from St. AUSTIN, for the express purpose of explaining the meaning in which God is said to be man's debtor, whilst he, at the same time instructs his reader to annex a meaning to my language in direct contradiction to it? The whole passage in my page stands thus connected:—"A *right of grace* on the part of GOD, *not of merit* on the part of man; for *that*, we trust, is *universally disclaimed*. God has graciously condescended to become, in a certain sense, man's debtor; in the language of St. AUSTIN, "*non aliquid debendo, sed omnia promittendo, Deus se facit debitorem.*" Guide, p. 289. From this passage it is evident, that in saying that God had graciously condescended to become, "in a certain sense, man's debtor," I meant to be understood in that sense, in which St. AUSTIN uses the same expression, when he says, in the passage above quoted, that "GOD makes himself a debtor, not by owing any thing, but by promising all things;" *i. e.* as above explained, not by a debt of *service*, but by a debt of *promise*.

Now St. AUSTIN is good authority with Mr. O., whenever he appeals to him; why, then, is he passed by unnoticed, when brought before his eyes by the author of the "Guide to the Church?" By adverting to the point Mr. O. had undertaken to establish on this occasion, my reader will be at no loss to account for this singular circumstance. With this object in view, it will probably occur to him, that

Mr. O. proceeded, in the true Procrustes style, to squeeze and mangle the subject he had to deal with, till he had made it fit the frame appointed to contain it. For this purpose he began by cutting away that part of it which mentions "*merit on the part of man,*" as in direct contradiction to the point he had to make out; he then proceeded to lop off the quotation from St. AUSTIN, as inadmissible, because it rendered the meaning of the passage incapable of being misunderstood; and having thus reduced the author's language to the wished-for proportion, he then presented it in this mutilated condition to his readers. But lest, even in this imperfect state, the passage should still convey a sense incomparable with the proof he had to establish, in the place of the quotation from St. AUSTIN, Mr. O. introduces a quotation from St. PAUL; that is, he leaves out a passage in my page, which expressly told the reader what my meaning *was*, and inserts a passage in his own, which as expressly tells the reader what it *was not*; and for the apparent purpose of confirming that erroneous meaning, for which it was his object on this occasion to make the author of the "*Guide*" responsible. After having then observed on the expression of "*God being made man's debtor,*" that it was "*strange and incomprehensible doctrine,*" Mr. O. thus proceeds:—"The Apostle, however, is very intelligible and expresses on this subject. To him that *worketh*, the reward is not reckoned

of grace, but of *debt*." On comparing the two passages of St. PAUL and St. AUSTIN together, my reader will scarce think it possible that Mr. O. should not have discerned, that they were writing on two quite different subjects.

Mr. O. having thus, without ceremony, turned his favourite St. AUSTIN out of his place in my page, it was not to be expected that he should shew more respect to Bishop BULL. But when the reader has observed, that in the extract from this learned Bishop at the bottom of my page (289) the Romish doctrine of human merit is thus described, "*Error iste Pontificiorum quorundam toto animo detestandus;*" that error of certain Romish doctors is to be most unequivocally detested; in the Bishop's strong language, "*toto animo detestandus;*" it is probable, he may think that few writers, besides Mr. O., would have the hardihood, in the face of such a quotation, to assert, much more attempt to prove, that the author of "a Guide to the Church" was "not Protestant enough, wholly to exclude *our own merits* in this matter of our justification." P. 210.

Though, therefore, I am constrained to differ from Calvinists in the distinguishing Articles of their creed, I still cannot allow myself to consider Mr. O. as their representative, in *this* manner of doing justice to the writings of an author, to whom they may be opposed. At the same time, in justice to Mr. O. it must be observed, that he is understood in the

world, not to be so much the independent writer for, as the public reporter of a party; that the documents which his publication exhibits, have been furnished from various quarters; his chief office having been that of arranging and giving the *lucidus ordo* to the discordant mass of materials, with which his friends had supplied him. Should this, as from that part of Mr. O.'s publication now immediately before me, I should in charity conclude must, have been the case, Mr. O. may have been unintentionally led into errors by a too implicit confidence in the honesty of his assistants. Such a plea for the numberless garbled quotations to be met with in his publication, a regard for Mr. O.'s reputation, as a clergyman, disposes me most readily to admit.

Again, in p. 215, we find Mr. O. employed in proving, that "the salvation of a Christian," according to Mr. D., "*depends wholly upon his works*; works being clearly made by him the grand hinge on which our justification and salvation turn." "The sum of Mr. DAUBENY's doctrine, then, (says Mr. O.) as far as it is at all intelligible, (to me, should have been added; because the reader has repeatedly seen, that doctrine may be very intelligible *in itself*, and yet not intelligible *to Mr. O.*) is this—that admission into Christianity by faith places men in a state of *possible* salvation; but that whether this becomes a real, actual, and discriminating salvation to any believer, depends *wholly upon his works*; whether he

is really brought into a state of acceptance with God, depends wholly on his obedience to the moral law." P. 215. Upon the plan, according to which Mr. O. here draws up his charge against my writings, by taking a few words out of my book, and then making out the sentence with *his own words*, the Bible may be made to speak blasphemy, as might easily be proved. "Into a state of acceptance with God," and "obedience to the moral law," are certainly my words to be found in the page referred to, Guide 287; but "depends *wholly on his works*," though marked in Mr. O's page by Italics, that they might be impressed on his reader's mind, are not my words, but evidently an addition by Mr. O., for the purpose of making out that sense, for which it was his object to make me responsible. Having noticed this *fallacy*, my reader must be prepared for the conclusion. "Works, *therefore*," says Mr. O., "are clearly made the grand hinge on which our justification and salvation turn." But by *whom?* is the question. The passages which he has thought proper to make ministerial to the conclusion are these:—"Redemption from a state of certain condemnation, and a restoration to a state of *possible* salvation, together with a gracious provision of assistance to make that salvation sure." "But whether this state of possible salvation *through Christ* may become a state of actual salvation to the believing party, must depend upon the use made of the means vouchsafed

for that purpose." Again; "The clergy feel themselves called upon to enforce *obedience to the moral law*, as necessary to the accomplishment of the Christian scheme; necessary to bring fallen man into a state of acceptance with God, by qualifying him for the salvation that has been purchased." In the two first of these passages, I am alluding to the benefits annexed to admission into the Christian Church; in the latter, I am speaking of the duty of the clergy to enforce *obedience to the moral law*, as necessary to bring fallen man into a state of (*final*) acceptance with God (through CHRIST.)" On reading these passages over, then, as they apply, not to the case of baptized infants, but to Christians arrived at a state of self-responsibility, I see no reason to change a letter of them; for they contain, when properly understood, the doctrine of the Bible, and of the Church of England: and when the reader knows that in the same page, by way of prelude to one of the foregoing extracts, the following passage is to be found, he will think my meaning sufficiently intelligible, to render any particular answer to Mr. OVERTON'S construction of my language totally unnecessary. The passage is this—"Faith in the all-sufficient merits of a crucified Redeemer, must, by all who receive the Gospel, be admitted as the Christian's *only hope*, it being his *only title* to salvation." Guide, 299. To the sum of doctrine, however, here held out as mine, namely, that "works are clearly made the

*grand hinge* on which our justification and salvation turn," it may be proper to say something. In page 322 of the "Appendix," I say, that, "according to the terms of the new covenant, salvation is *wholly of grace*; it is the price, if we may so speak, of the merits of a crucified Saviour." How, then, can the sum of Mr. D.'s doctrine be, according to Mr. O.'s statement, "that salvation *wholly depends upon works*." There cannot be two *whollys* in this case. One of these positions must, therefore, necessarily be excluded, because they cannot co-exist. The first position is my own; the last, that which Mr. O. would fain fasten upon me.

The passages brought from my writings in p. 214 of Mr. O.'s publication, and which have been above particularized, constitute the several portions of Mr. D.'s *notorious divinity*, as Mr. O. calls it, to which he objects. As a minister of the Church of England, therefore, I feel myself pledged to maintain them, when properly understood, to be the divinity of the Bible, of our Reformers, and of our Church.

*That* salvation must be *only possible*, which may, by the conduct of the party concerned, be prevented from effectually taking place. The language of the Bible directs the Christian professor to "make his calling and election sure;" but no where speaks of an assurance independent of contingent circumstances. The Apostle to the Hebrews mentions the possibility of persons, after having been made partakers of the



Holy Ghost, and of the powers of the world to come, so falling away, as totally to lose all hope of recovery to a state of salvation. Heb. vi. 6. Our Reformers, speaking of the thief on the cross, say, "that if he had lived, and regarded not faith and works, he would have *lost his salvation again*." Our Church proceeds on this principle of *possible* not *absolute* salvation, in her prayer, that her members "may so pass through things temporal, that *finally they lose not* the things eternal." And the Catechumens, after having been admitted into a state of salvation by baptism, is taught to pray "that he may *continue* in it to his life's end;" a prayer which certainly supposes the possibility of the contrary event. To multiply proofs on this point, would be a work not more endless than useless. I therefore proceed to maintain, *obedience*, taken in a proper sense, to be a condition of salvation. By a condition is meant, not the *cause by which* an effect is produced, but the *circumstance without which* that effect will not take place. This simple distinction clears up the whole difficulty, if difficulty there must be in this case. St. PETER appears to have placed the plan of salvation through CHRIST in a clear light in his second epistle. After addressing himself, in the opening of of this Epistle to them, "that had obtained like precious faith with himself, through the righteousness of CHRIST," v. 1; them, consequently, who in the Apostle's judgment, had been placed in a state

of salvation by baptism; the Apostle, a few verses after, directs these same persons to "give diligence to make their calling and election *sure*;" or, as it is read in the King's MS. "by your good works to make your consolation and election firm."—"Δια των καλων υμων εργων βεβαιαν υμων την παρακλησιν."

"For if ye do these things, (which had before been pointed out as necessary to render them fruitful in the knowledge of CHRIST) ye shall never fall." V. 10. In St. PETER's judgment, then, the *security* of that election, of which those persons were in possession, who had received "like precious faith with himself," depended upon the diligence of the possessing party; since if such and such things were not done by them, they might fall from it. This proves (if any thing can) that the state of salvation, into which persons are admitted by faith, is a state only of *possible salvation*. "For so," continues the Apostle, *i. e.* by these means, or on the condition that ye do these things, "an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST." V. 11. The performance of the things here specified did, therefore, in the Apostle's judgment, constitute the *condition*, on which the everlasting kingdom of glory was to be secured to the party.

To this decisive proof from St. PETER appeal was made in p. 304 of the "Guide," for the purpose of ascertaining the sense in which this subject

was meant to be understood. Had, therefore, Mr. O. fairly laid this proof before his reader, together with the substance of the extract subjoined to it from the writings of Bishop BULL, there could have remained no possible doubt with respect to that orthodoxy, which has here been called in question. The extract I had made from Bishop BULL, when freely translated, runs thus:—"Let us now proceed to that other point, on which we meant briefly to remark; namely, that by the phrase "*ἐξ ἑργῶν*" St. JAMES did not mean that our works were either the *principal* or the *meritorious* cause of our justification; for that proceeds *wholly* from the free mercy of GOD the Father, by the death and merits of CHRIST *alone*, and is the doctrine maintained by the Apostle. For although the particle *ἐξ* sometimes has that force, yet is it often made use of in a lower and qualified sense, to denote a *certain mean through which a thing is obtained*, or a preceding condition, commonly called *causa sine qua non*; or the cause, without which the effect will not take place; although, in fact, it is scarce entitled to the name of a *cause*: and this mode of speech is neither irreconcilable with common sense, nor with the language of scripture. To pass over other proofs, when a man is said "*ἐκ πίστεως δικαισθαι*, to be justified by faith;" the particle *ἐκ* is manifestly used in this sense. For no man can be said to be justified even *by faith itself*, considered as the *principal cause*, or as *any cause* at

all, in the *proper* sense of that word. A man is therefore said “*ἐκ ἐργῶν δικαιωθῆαι*, to be justified by works, JAMES ii. 24, because good works are the *condition* which, according to the divine plan on which the Evangelical covenant was established, is necessarily requisite to his being justified; that is, to his obtaining that remission of sin which has been provided through CHRIST, and to his thereby being accepted of GOD unto salvation.”—BULL, Harm. Apost. cap. i. sec. 8.

The substance of Mr. O.’s objection to the divines against whom he writes, in his third Chapter, which professedly treats of the necessity of *practical* Christianity, was, if I understand him, that they were advocates only for *nominal* Christianity; and that they considered the members of the Church to be in such a state of salvation, “as that they will escape future punishment, and obtain everlasting happiness, *whatever be their characters*.”—See OVERTON, p. 102. In the Chapter now immediately before us, the objection made to my doctrine is, that the “state of possible salvation, into which the members of the Church have been admitted, becoming a state of actual (*i. e.* final) salvation to the believing party, must depend on the use made of the means of grace; and that obedience to the moral law is the condition on which Christians are taught to look for salvation.” P. 215.

Leaving Mr. O. to reconcile these glaring inconsistencies in his publication, I pass on to ask, what objection there can be to the word *condition*, as above explained by Bishop BULL? To me the word *covenant* and *condition* appear so necessarily connected, that I can form no idea of the one independent of the other. Every person, to be entitled to admission into the Church by baptism, enters, either by self or proxy, into a solemn engagement, consisting of three parts, namely, Repentance, Faith, and Obedience. If, then, the profession of this engagement was necessary to give a title to the privileges annexed to the baptismal covenant; it is clear, that the fulfilment of such engagement must *a fortiori* be necessary to secure the continued possession of them. From whence it follows, that without faith, repentance, and obedience, the privileges annexed to the baptismal covenant, namely, pardon of sin, and salvation through CHRIST, will not be secured to the baptized party. Faith, repentance, and obedience, then, though not the causes by which salvation is produced, are still those circumstances or conditions, without which, in conformity with the plan of the Divine covenant, salvation will not take place.

Mr. O., p. 218, says, that the Church, “when treating directly on the *means* or *condition*, or whatever it is called, by which we obtain justification, says, it is *by faith only*, *by faith without works*, or as it is perfectly distinct from obedience to the

law, namely, as it *directly sends us* to, and *embraces CHRIST.*” But though faith does *directly send us to CHRIST* for salvation, and the profession of this faith alone, if sincere, does give us our *original* title to that salvation, still this same faith must be afterward accompanied with its proper fruits, to secure the perpetuity of that important title. Mr. O., it is presumed, is here referring to the Eleventh Article, on *Justification*; on the ground of which Article he admits faith to be the *means* or *condition* of justification, and considers this Article as furnishing a proof of his position, that *faith only* is the condition of justification; because in this Article, which, in Mr. O.’s opinion, treats directly of the *means* or *condition* of justification, *faith only* is mentioned. But to me this Article does not appear to justify Mr. O.’s conclusion from it, and for the following reason. The Eleventh Article is built on that celebrated passage of St. PAUL, Rom. iii. 28, “Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law;” together with the parallel passage in his Epistle to the Galatians, “Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of JESUS CHRIST, even we have believed in JESUS CHRIST, that we might be justified by the faith of CHRIST, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.” The sense in which these expressions, “justified by faith without the deeds of the law,” and “not justi-

fi ed by the works of the law but by faith," were used by the Apostle in the foregoing passages, will guide us to the meaning intended to be conveyed by our Reformers in the Eleventh Article.

The great error which St. PAUL, as the apostle of the Gentiles, was strenuous in counteracting in his Epistle to the Galatians, was *that* entertained by some Judaizing Christians, respecting circumcision being necessary to qualify the Gentile converts to become partakers with them in the privileges of the Gospel covenant. This error the Apostle combats by the following train of reasoning:—"We, who ~~are~~ Jews by nature," says he, "born under the law, and not sinners of the Gentiles, even we have believed in CHRIST for justification, knowing that a man is not justified by the deeds of the law. If, then, we, who are Jews, believe that justification cannot be had by the law of MOSES, but by faith only in JESUS CHRIST, on what foot of reason are the Gentile converts compellable to conform to the law of MOSES for justification?" But this is not all; there is still a further and more important consideration to be taken into the account. If while *we Jews* thus seek to be justified by CHRIST, we ourselves also are found sinners, which must be the case, if the observations of the law of MOSES be still necessary to our justification; is, therefore, CHRIST the minister of sin? Is CHRIST the author of a dispensation, which leaves men under the guilt and

punishment of sin? God forbid. To seek *justification*, therefore, by the works of the law, is to frustrate the grace of God, to *throw contempt* (*αδερω* in the original, signifying to *reject* or *contemn*) upon the Christian dispensation, as incapable of granting what it professes to grant to all who sincerely embrace it; for if righteousness or justification come by the law, if the law can so constitute sinners righteous as to secure their acceptance with God, then CHRIST is dead in vain, the death of CHRIST for that purpose is altogether needless.

Such is the substance of the Apostle's *conclusive* argument on this subject, which directly refers *only* to the case of the Judaizing Christian, who still maintained a conformity to the Mosaic Ritual as necessary to justification. But our Reformers, in their Homily on Salvation, apply the foregoing passage, taken from the Epistle to the Galatians, to the case of *baptized Christians*; for immediately after speaking of the justification, conveyed by baptism, they say, "this is that justification or righteousness which St. PAUL speaketh of, when he sayeth, no man is justified by the works of the law, but freely by faith in JESUS CHRIST." The justification of which St. PAUL speaks, is evidently *justification by faith only*, to the exclusion of the works of the law, considered as either in opposition to, or at least incompatible with it. To make the language, therefore, of the Apostle, which immediately referred to



the Judaizing Christian of his day, apply to Christians in general, the works and deservings of the Christian must correspond with the works of the law, against which the Apostle's argument was directed, *in this respect*, that they are insisted upon, as giving a title of justification to the party. In such case, the conclusion of St. PAUL's argument applies as well to the modern Christian, as it did to those to whom it was originally addressed. By setting up a species of justification *by works*, that is, in opposition to or incompatible with that justification under the Gospel by faith only, the Christian frustrates or rejects the grace of GOD in CHRIST; for if righteousness or justification is to be obtained "by works or deservings of our own," then is CHRIST dead in vain, the Gospel dispensation is then become ineffectual. These two passages, then, from the Apostle's writings, Rom. iii. 28, Gal. ii. 16, which constitute the ground on which the Eleventh Article was built, evidently refer to that justification conveyed to the party on his admission into Christianity, to which faith was the only requisite title. In this sense, *faith alone*, without any consideration of works whatever, is that by which sinners are justified; since it was by this that Jews and Gentiles became members of the Christian Church, and thereby entitled to the benefits of redemption by CHRIST JESUS. Consequently, the Article in question, as relating to the same subject, must be considered as speaking only

of the *meritorious cause* of justification, in opposition to human works of every kind, and of the mean or condition by which such justification was to be obtained; or, in Mr. O.'s words, "the mean by which we apprehend and become interested in CHRIST's merits, for this justification." P. 199. The language of this Article, then, is strictly proper, when properly understood; and the reader will perceive, that faith being mentioned in it as the *only* condition of justification, though necessary to the sense in which justification is *there* placed, furnishes no argument against works being also admitted to be a condition of justification, when the subject is taken up on different ground. To prove that the language of this Article would have been changed, had the subject of it been more extended, and justification been placed (as it must be placed, to understand the Bible fully) in two different points of view, instead of being considered in *one only*, it will be necessary to bring the two Apostles, St. PAUL and St. JAMES, together.

Mr. O., in p. 199, very properly marks out the peculiar application of the two prepositions *propter* and *per* in the Eleventh Article, one applied to the *merit* of CHRIST, the other to *faith*. "We are justified only, *propter*, for (or on account of) the merit of CHRIST, and not, *propter*, for (or on account of) 'our own works, &c. *per fidem*, through faith, as the *mean*, &c. and *sola fide*, by faith only, in the sense in which the subject is here understood."

Thus far Mr. O. and myself are perfectly agreed, as will appear by reference to the 172d page of the Appendix, where the same observation on the distinctive nature of these two prepositions is almost literally to be found. My reader will now see wherein the difference between us, on this subject, consists. Mr. O. admits faith to be a *mean* or *condition* of justification, but considers it to be the *only condition*, on the ground of no other being mentioned in the Eleventh Article. So far as the expressions *per fidem* and *sola fide*, *through faith*, and *by faith only*, apply to the subject of the Eleventh Article, I perfectly agree with him. At the same time, I maintain that faith and Christian works are *equally conditions*, when considered with a view to man's *final* justification at the day of judgment; that so they were considered by our Reformers; and that, had they been speaking of this subject in the Eleventh Article, they would, to the phrase *per fidem*, by faith, have added *per opera*, by works, those necessary accompaniments of true faith—both faith and works being equally considered by them, not as either the principal or meritorious causes, or *properly* speaking, any causes at all, but according to Bishop BULL's distinction, "*causæ sine quibus non*, causes or conditions, which, though shut out from the office of justifying, were still necessary to be present in him that is justified;" as without which justification through CHRIST will not *finally* take place. The

reader now sees the reason why, as I conceive, works were not mentioned as a condition with faith in the Eleventh Article; consequently Mr. O.'s observation, admitting the truth of it, that, "if the doctrine is, that faith and good works are the conditions of salvation, it is strange, that in none of her express writings she should have affirmed this," so far as it applies to the Article under consideration, is an observation of no force.

To prove the above point, however, relative to faith and works being *equally* conditions of justification, I submit to my reader the following appeal to Apostolic authority. The phrase *per fidem*, by faith, adopted by our Reformers in the Eleventh Article, is a literal translation of the phrase *δια πίστεως*, made use of by the Apostle, Gal. ii. 16. But the phrase *δια πίστεως* the Apostle exchanges in the same verse for *ἐκ πίστεως*; and in our translation both these prepositions *δια* and *ἐκ* are considered as conveying the same sense, for they are rendered in the same way. The preposition *δια*, with a genitive case, the Greek scholar knows to be the peculiar note of a *condition* or *mean*, not of a *cause*; and whether we say *δια* or *ἐκ πίστεως*, by or through faith, or *from* faith, we equally describe faith as the *condition*. The whole verse of St. PAUL runs thus:—"Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but *δια πίστεως*, by the faith of JESUS CHRIST, even we have believed in JESUS CHRIST, that we might

be justified *ἐκ πίστεως*, by the faith, of CHRIST, and not *ἐξ ἔργων*, by the works, of the law; for *ἐξ ἔργων*, by the works, of the law shall no flesh be justified." Gal. ii. 16. What then St. PAUL here says of faith to the exclusion of the works of the law, St. JAMES says *equally* both of faith and works, for he prefixes the same preposition to *both words*.

The conclusion of his argument on the subject of faith and works, as summed up in the 24th verse of the second Chapter, is this:—"Ye see, then, how that, *ἐξ ἔργων*, by works a man is justified, and not, *ἐκ πίστεως μόνον*, by faith only." Now as these two Apostles wrote under the direction of the same Spirit, it is not possible that, on an essential article of the Christian faith, they could in reality differ from each other. A sense, therefore, must be found out for their respective language, according to which the different positions laid down by them will not militate against each other, and that sense is this:—St. PAUL was writing about that justification conveyed to the party on his admission into Christianity by baptism, to which faith only was the requisite title, according to the established principle on which the Evangelical ministry uniformly proceeded, namely, *believe and be baptized*. Whereas, St. JAMES was speaking of the condition of the same party, subsequent to that admission; and of those works of faith necessary to qualify him for his *final* justification in his Christian character. The Christ-

ian, then, is to be justified by faith without works, which bear any correspondence with those meant by St. PAUL; because those were works of legal obedience, which set up a *meritorious claim*, on their own account, to justification: At the same time, he is not to be justified by faith, without the works meant by St. JAMES; these being the works of Evangelical obedience, acceptable only through CHRIST, and without which faith is dead; works which, St. AUSTIN observed, it was the object of St. JAMES, St. PETER, St. JOHN, and St. JUDE, in their respective epistles, particularly to enforce; on the principle, "*fidem sine operibus nihil prodesse*," that faith without works profited nothing.—*Aug. de Fid. et. Op. cap. xiv.* "So that (in the words of Mr. PEARSON) the whole difference of meaning between St. PAUL and St. JAMES, and which sufficiently accounts for the difference in their expressions, amounts to this—That St. PAUL is speaking of the *meritorious* cause of our being admitted into a state of salvation; and that St. JAMES is speaking of the *conditional* cause of our *continuing* in a state of salvation, and of being finally saved."\* And that our Reformers had this particular justification in view, when they penned the Eleventh Article, is evident from their reference for more full explanation of the subject to the Homily on Justification, or as it is entitled, "Sermon of the Salvation of Mankind." For in that sermon, im-

\* PEARSON's first Letter to OVERTON, p. 24.

mediately after mentioning the baptism of infants, and its consequence, and then speaking of the state of those who sin after baptism, that in case of their “turning to God unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by his sacrifice from their sins,” that is, they are restored again to that justification originally conveyed to them by baptism, our Reformers thus proceed:—“This is *that justification*, or righteousness, which St. PAUL speaketh of, when he sayeth, no man is justified by the works of the law, but freely by faith in JESUS CHRIST,” &c. The reference made on this occasion being to that passage in the Epistle to the Galatians above laid before my reader, in which the Apostle is evidently speaking of the admission of Gentile converts into the Christian Church; which, consequently, must apply to *that justification received by baptism*, and which, when lost by sin, was to be recovered by the sincere repentance of the baptized party.

Whoever would form a compleat system of divinity, must so read the Scripture as to make it consistent with itself; and whoever would do justice to our Reformers, must understand them in the sense in which they meant to be understood. St. PAUL and St. JAMES, it is admitted, on the subject of justification, appear in *words* to be, at times, in decided contradiction to each other. But by attending to *things* more than to *words*; by considering the circumstances under which each Apostle wrote:

and the particular object each had in view, this apparent contradiction becomes reconciled; and St. PAUL and St. JAMES, from the general tenor of their writings, are found equal maintainers of the same general doctrine of salvation.

CRANMER, in his "Homily on Salvation," had in view the corrupt Romish doctrine of merit; that *error toto animo detestandus*, as BULL calls it; against which CRANMER thought he could not too strongly express himself. But by bringing all the expressions made use of in this Homily against the corrupt Romish doctrine, to bear against the doctrine of those who maintain good works to be *only a condition* of justification, that *sine quâ non*, without which justification through CHRIST will not be *finally* vouchsafed to the party, is to apply CRANMER's language in a sense in which he certainly did not mean that it should be understood; because he has elsewhere expressed himself with marked decision on this point. This is that mode of interpretation, which opens into a boundless field of controversy, without being calculated to convey correct information on any subject. Indeed, according to this plan of detaching words from their local and appropriate meaning, controversy must be endless, and conviction unattainable; because the language brought forward in proof, whether it be that of inspiration or of our Reformers, does not, in such case, speak the sense of the *writer*, but that of the *reader*.



If I have dwelt longer on this point than by some may be judged necessary, it has been with the view of dispersing that mist of fallacy, in which Mr. O.'s confused manner of handling the subject of justification appears to involve it; and thereby to enable my reader to see clearly, what is the doctrine of the Scripture, and of our Church upon it.

The great cardinal point on which the salvation of man turns, is confessedly the *meritorious* office of JESUS CHRIST. So far, then, as this fundamental point is concerned, there appears to be no real difference of opinion between Mr. O. and myself. The only question, therefore, is, whether what is further said on the subject of justification, from the warrant of scripture, does in any manner encroach on this great and established principle. The alarm that has been taken on this score, when applied to divines as zealous for the doctrines of grace as the alarmists themselves, is not only without reason, but is moreover calculated to do injury to that cause, which all ministers of CHRIST should have equally at heart. Mr. O. admits faith to be a *condition* of justification. P. 218. By this admission Mr. O. could not mean, that faith should in any degree encroach on the above cardinal point, on which salvation turns. The admitting something, therefore, to be a condition of justification in itself distinct from the *meritorious* cause of it, is not by Mr. O. considered to be inconsistent with sound divinity. But if the admitting one

thing to be a condition of justification distinct from the meritorious cause of it is consistent with sound divinity, the admitting another on the same ground cannot make it less sound. The admission of *works*, therefore, as a *condition* of justification, must be as consistent with sound divinity, as the admission of *faith* on the same principle.

But Mr. O., from the authority of the Eleventh Article, represents faith to be the *only condition* of justification, to the exclusion of good works, because the Article says we are justified “*by faith only.*” It has been above proved, that such inference is not warranted by the tenor of the Article in question; and that our Reformers, when speaking with a view to the *meritorious* cause of justification, put faith and works on the same footing, by excluding *both* equally from the office of justifying; at the same time they say, “that faith doth not shut out the justice of our good works, necessarily to be done.” *Homily*, p. 15. If good works are necessarily to be done after man is justified, (for they cannot be done before) our Reformers must have considered them as necessary to be done, with a view to that Christian state in which a member of the Church must be found, to be *finally* saved; consequently, they were necessary as a *condition*, without which the *final* justification of the sinner would not take place: for it is absurd to suppose that our Reformers could mean, in the sense in which Mr.

O. takes these words, that *faith alone* was the *condition* of justification, to the exclusion of those works, without which they considered the faith of a Christian professor to be no better than the faith of Devils. To maintain, therefore, that *faith only* is the condition of justification, to the exclusion of those works which alone constitute that faith a *valuable condition*, is to misrepresent, but not to understand, the doctrine of the Church of England; and were Mr. O. to write ten volumes, in addition to the one he has already written, he would never be able to prove, to the satisfaction of any reasonable man, that those performances, *without which* justification is not *finally* to be obtained, are not called, in the *proper* sense of the word, a *condition* of obtaining it.

I have now gone through this unnecessarily involved subject; and trust I have committed myself upon it in such a manner as to convince, if not Mr. O., every unprejudiced reader, that I am just as sound a Protestant as our Reformers were; considering it to be no impeachment of that character, that I know (what every divine of the Church of England ought to know) where to draw the line of discrimination, between the genuine fundamental doctrines of grace, and that gross heretical superstructure, which J. CALVIN raised upon it, and for which, in part at least, Mr. O. appears an advocate.

It may be necessary, before I conclude the present Chapter, to lay before my reader a few of the

numberless authorities, that might be produced to establish the point in question. The passage from St. Peter, 2 Ep. i. 5, 6, &c., above commented upon, speaks so plainly to this subject, as to leave no possible doubt on the mind of any intelligent Christian; and were I to refer to all the passages in the Bible, in which the same doctrine is either declared or implied, I should furnish matter for a volume. In the "Institution of a Christian Man," chiefly the work of CRANMER, under the Article on Justification, it is said, that "this blessing is granted *for* the merits and satisfaction of our Blessed SAVIOUR, that our pardon stands upon *this ground*; and that no good works on our part could reconcile us unto GOD, procure his favour, and prevail for justification. However, this benefit is suspended *upon conditions*; such as, reliance upon the Divine Goodness, observing ~~our~~ SAVIOUR's commands, and performing the offices of justice and charity."

The opinion of Bishop BULL on this subject the reader has already seen; which, though of no authority with Mr. O., will certainly be of weight with every one who *properly* appreciates the character of that great and exemplary divine. Having been honoured with being considered to be a pupil of Bishop BULL, it was to be expected that I should take a leaf out of his book; and it will ever be among the first objects of my ambition to copy, in any degree, after so great a master.

But though Bishop BULL is no authority with Mr. O., that excellent and amiable divine Bishop HORNE must be; Mr. O. himself having appealed to him as such. The following quotation from this good man Mr. O. must have seen (it is presumed) in the 175th page of the Appendix:—"I call works a *necessary condition* of our justification, because most certain it is, that the only *meritorious* cause thereof is the satisfaction of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST, &c. But in the Gospel Covenant, to which we are admitted by baptism, *faith* and *works* are the *conditions*, to the performance of which, through the power of his grace, God has annexed the promises of redemption; and *without* the performance, a right to those promises can neither be acquired nor preserved. That faith is such a necessary condition all Christians are agreed."

The last authority I shall adduce, for quotations on this subject might be endless, shall be that of the pious and exemplary Bishop of LONDON, who, in his late publication, delivers the genuine doctrine of the Gospel, and of our Church, on this important point, in the following clear and decided language:—"Yet however firmly we may believe all the great essential doctrines of the Gospel, *this alone* will not ensure our salvation, unless to our faith we add *obedience* to all the laws of CHRIST. This we are expressly told in the concluding verse of this Chapter. After our LORD had prescribed to his Disciples the

form of words to be used in baptism, he adds; 'teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' By making this the conclusion, the winding-up, as it were, of his Gospel, he meant to express, in the strongest manner, the indispensable necessity of a holy life resulting from a vital faith. The belief of the Christian Revelation, if genuine and sincere, will, with the blessing of God on our own strenuous exertions, produce all those Christian graces and virtues, which, through the merits of our Redeemer, will render our *final* calling and election sure." *Porteus, Lect. 24.*

I now return to Mr. O.'s page, 215, where, after having given his own account of my doctrine in the manner above remarked, he proceeds thus:—"And is it not now astonishing, that persons assuming the high office of guardians of our literature and established theology, should affirm that the doctrines of Mr. D.'s 'Guide' are strictly conformable to the Articles and Liturgy of the Church of England, particularly in the two great points of Election and Justification. Is it not astonishing, that any persons of sense and character should pretend, that all this is adherence to the doctrine of our Church! These teachers thus, in effect, make *works every thing*, or, at least, the grand turning point in the matter of our salvation. Our Church calls upon us to consider diligently, that *they who believe in CHRIST are saved without works by faith only*, freely re-

ceiving the remission of their sins. *They* teach, that, in order to obtain pardon and acceptance with God, we must be ‘righteous,’ ‘holy,’ ‘qualified by our obedience to the moral law,’ and perform all these *conditions* of good works. *Her* uniform doctrine is, that ‘*faith only justifieth* ;’ that in applying to God for this blessing, we ‘must forsake all our good works,’ &c. ; that we must not do any good works ‘to this intent, to be made just by doing of them ;’ nay, that we cannot, till *after we are justified*, do a good work.”

To such language it does not appear necessary that any thing should be said ; because it seems to be paying a bad compliment “to persons of sense and character,” not to suppose them qualified, after what has been laid before them in this Chapter, to distinguish between my doctrine, as it is to be found in my own pages, and as it is represented in the pages of Mr. OVERTON ; and to be prepared thence to determine, which doctrine is most “strictly conformable to the Articles and Liturgy of the Church of England”—that of the author of “A Guide to the Church,” or that of the author of “The true Churchman ascertained.”

But as Mr. O.’s confident method of asking questions on this occasion may impose on the cursory reader, I think it necessary for me, for once at least, to follow his example, by putting some questions in my turn. Is it not, then, astonishing, that a minister of

the Church of England, "assuming the high office" of *censor-general* of his clerical brethren, "should affirm that the doctrines of Mr. D.'s 'Guide' are not conformable to the Articles and Liturgy of the Church of England," to the *unadulterated* standard of which they have in general been considered strictly conformable?—"Is it not astonishing, that any person of sense and character should *pretend*," that Mr. D. "makes *works every thing*, or, at least, the grand turning point in the matter of our salvation," when Mr. D. has maintained, in the most decided and unequivocal language, the very *opposite* doctrine; nay, when there is not one single passage, taken with its context, to be produced from the whole course of his writings, that can justify such a charge? "Is it not astonishing, that any person of sense and character" should be either incapable or unwilling to discriminate between being justified without works, considered as the *meritorious cause* of such justification; and not being justified without works as a *condition*, or the *sine quâ non*, without which an effect, though produced by another cause, will not take place?

When our Reformers tells us, that "faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and fear of God, to be joined with faith in every one that is justified, nor the justice of good works necessary to be done; but shutteth them out from the office of justifying, so that, although they be all pre-



sent in him that is justified, yet they justify not altogether ;”\* “ is it not astonishing, that any man of sense and character” should not perceive, that what is truly affirmed in *one sense*, is as truly denied in *another* ; that although man is justified without works, as the *cause* of his justification, because works are “ shut out from the office of justifying ;” still, from the consideration that works are necessary to be present in him that is justified, that *in this sense* he is not justified without them ?

The expression, “ *faith only justifieth*,” introduced into the “ Homily on Salvation,” our Reformers themselves admit not to be *strictly correct* : “ It is not,” they say, “ that this our own faith *doth justify us* ; for justification is the office of God only, by the *only merits* of our REDEEMER ;” nor is it the meaning of the expression, “ that justifying faith is alone in man, and that we are so to be justified *without good works*, that we should do no good works at all ; but this saying, that we be justified by faith only, freely, and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly *all merit* of our works.”† When any divine then says, with our Reformers, that works are necessary to be present in him that is justified, without which consequently his justification does not take place ; at the same time, that they are unequivocally shut out from the office of justifying, because unpossessed of merit for the purpose ;

\* Homily on Salvation.

† *Ibid.* p. 16.

does he not in effect say the same thing? Mr. O.'s observation, "that we must not do any good works, to the intent to be *made just* by doing them every sound divine readily admits; at the same time, that he considers, what Mr. O. proceeds to observe, "that we cannot, till after we are justified, do a good work," to be at least nothing to the present purpose; or, as Dr. WATERLAND says, "it is impertinent and frivolous, if not hurtful, to amuse the ignorant with such notions, which in our circumstances may much better be spared."

But to meet Mr. O. on his own ground. Is it to be supposed, that men of understanding in their profession, when speaking of *good works*, can mean those works which precede the cause, which alone entitles them to the characteristic distinction of *good works*? In supposing this, Mr. O. gives them no more credit for sound sense, than he would do for sound divinity. Mr. O., with the view of getting rid of that innocent word *condition*, which is so offensive to him, informs his readers, that the Church considers it as impossible for good works to be a *condition* of justification, as it is for the *effect* to precede its *cause*, by constantly representing these works as the fruits and effects of justification. To the same purpose, and with the same want of discrimination, Mr. O. said before, (in p. 205) "if good works are thus the *fruits of faith*, and only follow *after* justification, then they certainly cannot go before

this blessing. Fruit certainly cannot exist prior to the tree which bears it, nor the *effect* antecedently to its *cause*. And if these works cannot precede justification, but are themselves the fruits and consequences of it, then they cannot be either the *cause* or condition of justification. *Causes* and *conditions* necessarily precede that of which they are the *causes* or *conditions*." P. 205. This, it must be allowed, seems plausible; and has, perhaps, with some readers, passed for *sound* reasoning. What can be more clear, as a general proposition, than what follows a thing; cannot at the same time go before it? But what if, after all, this apparently clear reasoning is built upon a fallacy, which requires only to be pointed out?

According to the doctrine of the Church of England, the *infant* is justified in baptism, without either repentance, faith, or works; in consequence of the engagement entered into, on his behalf, by *his sureties*. The *adult*, whose case rarely occurs in our Church, being fitly prepared, is immediately justified in baptism, by *faith*. Consequently, till he is possessed of faith, he cannot be justified. Good works are the fruit of faith. The fruit cannot exist prior to the tree that bears it. It follows, then, that before justification no good works can be produced. So far we are clear. " Good works (says St. AUSTIN) go not before, in him which shall afterward be justified; but good works do follow after,

when a man is *first justified*.”\* At what time soever, then, this *first* justification takes place, whether at infant baptism, or at what other time of man’s life it may take place, it is admitted that no good works can precede it. Had the divines in question, then, maintained, that *good works* constituted a condition, without which this *first* justification would not take place; they had maintained a position, not more incompatible with the language of the Apostle, than contradictory to the doctrine of the Church. But though no good works can precede *this* justification, take place when it may, for the reason above specified; yet good works follow after it in this world; otherwise there can be no good works at all. And if good works follow after justification in this world, as our Article must be understood to say, they certainly precede that final justification, which is to be pronounced in the next world at the day of judgment. To represent good works, then, as a condition with a view to man’s *future* justification, is not unsound doctrine, but the doctrine of the Church of England. In her Collect for the 13th Sunday after Trinity, she teaches those who have been admitted into a state of justification by baptism, and whom, on that account, she addresses as elect children of God, thus to pray:—“ Grant, we beseech Thee, that we may *so* faithfully serve Thee in this life, that we fail not *finally* to attain thy heavenly promises,

\* Homily on Good Works, p. 82.

through the merits of JESUS CHRIST, our Lord." The Church does not tell her children, that the heavenly promises are to be obtained as the *price* of their faithful service; but she clearly teaches them to understand their faithful service to be a *condition*, without which the promises, purchased by CHRIST's merits, will not be obtained by them. When divines of the Church of England, therefore, speak of good works as a *condition* of justification, it might be supposed, that no person of sense and candour could be at any loss for their meaning. Mr. O., however, does not appear to understand them—I fear, it may be said, does *not choose* to understand them; because, by reference to p. 583 of the Appendix, to which Mr. O. so frequently refers, my reader will find this doctrine so clearly laid down, as to require only the common sense of the most moderately intelligent person perfectly to comprehend it. "Good works," I say, "follow after man's *first* justification, because man can do no good works before he is brought acquainted with the principle upon which alone *good works* can be done: *in that sense*, they may be considered as an *effect* proceeding from a cause. But good works must also go before man's *final* justification, otherwise man can perform no good works at all: *in that sense*, they may be considered as a qualification preparatory to an event." Appendix, p. 583. When Mr. O., therefore, attempts to reason from our Article, (how

*conclusively* my reader will judge) that good works cannot be a *condition* of justification, because *the effect cannot precede its cause*, he is quibbling on the word *justification*; because he cannot but know, that the doctrine to which he here objects, cannot militate against the Twelfth Article, because it refers to a different subject; and that in fact it is objectionable only, because he is not willing to understand the divines against whom he writes, in the sense in which they mean to be understood.

After all, then, the argument Mr. O. has here methodically put together, and which may possibly bring conviction to those who read only what supports the opinion they have previously embraced, yields to the following simple solution—that good works, which necessarily follow after justification *in one sense*, as necessarily go before it *in another*; and there does not appear to me to be any but *Calvinistic* ground, on which Mr. O.'s reasoning in this case can stand. According to the Calvinistic axiom, indeed, of "*once justified, always justified*;" it may be maintained, that good works cannot *at any time* go before justification; justification, in this case, being considered as one *continued* act of *indefectible* grace, from the first conveyance of it in this life to its final consummation in glory. Supposing the justification of certain chosen individuals to have been thus *definitively* and *unconditionally* settled by an antecedent decree in their favour, such justifica-

tion cannot, in their case, be subject to the contingency of subsequent conditions. But as this is not the doctrine of the Church of England, I shall not waste my reader's time in dwelling upon it. Should it be the doctrine of Mr. O., it will be more creditable for him to maintain it openly, that all his readers may know what is meant, than to attempt to support it *indirectly*, by the help of fallacious reasoning.

Mr. O. now proceeds to his conclusion, which is summed up nearly in his usual style. "Enough," says he, "must have been said to convince all impartial judges, that even this most favourable ground of our opponents is not fairly tenable, and that on this most important of all doctrines, (Justification) they do not, as they would pretend, teach, as it is taught in the standard writings of our Church, and was taught by our Reformers. Whether regard is had to the *nature* of justification and promise of *justifying faith*, or to the *means* by which justification is obtained; *their deviation* from this acknowledged standard, and *our strict adherence* to it, are thus equally conspicuous. Our position, therefore, we conceive, is again established on a double basis, and that of our opponents doubly overthrown."

Recollecting himself, however, a little, Mr. O. afterwards condescends to add the following qualifying sentence:—"But whether our premises warrant this conclusion, or whether, at any rate, our claim

to Churchmanship is not the best founded of the two, let every competent judge decide."

Be it so. The scales of judgment are with the reader; let him hold them with an even hand, and adjust the weight at his leisure. "*Fiat justitia.*"

---

## CHAPTER VII.

*The Question of Adherence pursued in respect to the Doctrine of good Works; with a Vindication of our Tenets on this Head.*

### SECTION I.

*Concerning the Standard of Morals.*

THE chapter on which we are now entering, appears so foreign from the subject professed to be undertaken, that it might, without injustice to my reader, be passed over unnoticed. An apology for those ministers whose cause Mr. O. advocates, did not necessarily lead him into the contents of the present section; for let the charge against them be what it may, a counter-charge against their supposed opponents cannot be admitted as a proper set-off against it. This is to *recriminate*, but not



to *disprove* : a mode of proceeding which indicates, generally speaking, either the weakness of a cause, or the little judgment of its manager. In the present case, Mr. O., I am inclined to think, would have done more credit to himself, as well as more service to his clients, had he confined himself to the character in which he professedly committed himself to the public, as the *apologist* for a supposed misrepresented body, without assuming that of the general accuser of his brethren. It might have occurred to Mr. O., that the evidence delivered by him in the present section, relative to the principles and characters of his opponents, is that kind of *ex parte* evidence, which can constitute no standard of judgment to the mind of any candid or considerate person. For this chapter, when taken together, contains no more than the unqualified eulogy pronounced by Mr. O. on himself and his friends, as ministers of the Church, contrasted with the indiscriminate condemnation, which he has thought proper to pass on those against whom he has taken up his pen.

The rules which Mr. O., in cool reflection, laid down in his Preface, for the conduct of his publication, are as proper, as his violation of them, I am sorry to say, appears to be frequent :—" It is not (says the Preface) the writer's intention, that a single passage should be applied to any divines who do not professedly hold the doctrine advanced in their works ; or that they should be responsible for

the doctrines of each other, any further than they professedly agree." And again; "Whatever is not proved by a whole body of evidence, rendered strong and invincible by the harmony and support of all its parts, and interpreted as it would be by plain honest men of sound understanding and sufficient information, shall be considered as not proved at all." P. 8. It will be seen how far the chapter before us conforms to these equitable preliminaries. In p. 220 Mr. O. complains, that "the most open clamour, the most frequent insinuation against the whole system of the divines for whom he pleads, is, that they *depreciate good morals*." The method he has taken to do away such charge, is the opposing to it a counter-charge; the object of which is to lead to the conclusion, that those divines who are generally stigmatized by Calvinists as *moral* preachers, have, in fact, no pretensions, either as writers or men, to any morality at all. In a former chapter, p. 97, he had observed, that they were enemies to the doctrine of grace:—"It is to the doctrine of salvation by grace, through faith in the Redeemer, (says Mr. O.) under whatever form or name it is, to which, in reality, they at the bottom object." And the principal object of the chapter on *justification* is to prove, that these divines, and the author of "a Guide to the Church" in particular, build the hope of salvation, in a great degree at least, on the foundation of *human merit*. Admitting such to

be the case, it seems reasonable, on the supposition that they are men of common understanding, that their system of morals must be of the most exact and perfect kind, since so much is made to depend upon it. But no such thing. These *moral* divines, as they are opprobriously called, who in one page are described as making "morality their all in all," p. 272, are so inconsistent with themselves, (if Mr. O.'s assertions be admitted) that they consider "all the nominal members of the Church to be in such a state of salvation, as that they will escape future punishment, and obtain everlasting happiness, *whatever be their characters.*" P. 102. With the view of completing the picture which Mr. O. has thought fit to draw of those whom he opposes, and whom he thus represents, just as it may suit the immediate purpose, either as enemies to the doctrines of grace, as Popish moralists, or as no moralists at all; he proceeds, in the chapter before us, to accommodate, in a degree, the general likeness he has taken, to the individuals to whom it is to be applied. Thus, for instance, from some few insulated passages taken from the writings of Messrs. LUDLAM, CLAPHAM, and POLWHELE, together with some few others, as commented upon by Mr. O.; a conclusion is drawn for the whole body of clergy, who are the objects of censure, "that the first and great commandment" is considered by them, "as a mere subsidiary to the second;" that their doctrine is, "that we must serve

God only for man's sake ; because, in some degree, it is requisite to secure the good order of society."

P. 236. From the duties of the first table, Mr. O. proceeds to those of the second ; which, according to the doctrines and supposed practices of the divines in question, as exemplified by some partial extracts from the writings of Drs. CARR, CROFT, and PALEY, Mr. POLWHELE, and others, are represented to be, at least, in an equal state of degradation. Not only a want of decency, of candour, veracity, and Christian charity, is laid to their charge ; but they stand condemned, in a body, of still higher crimes—of "vindicating and even pleading for the violation of the laws of the land, the laws of the church, the admonitions of their ordinary, their own solemn oath, and every motive that can bind the conscience or influence the conduct of an honest man;" p. 255 ; together with possessing unconstitutional principles, destructive of order and government. It is with satisfaction that I congratulate my reader, on my not being obliged to detain him long on the subject of the present chapter. For although the charges contained in it are marked by no discrimination, so that they are applicable to the *whole body* of the clergy, against whom they are professedly brought ; still as I do not feel myself implicated in them, I shall confine my attention to those parts of this chapter, which more immediately bear upon myself. In p. 260 Mr. O. writes thus:—" These

divines make high pretensions to candour and liberality of sentiment, 'thank God that they feel no portion of that *odium theologicum*, which leads divines to speak harshly or disrespectfully of those who may happen to dissent from them,' and value themselves in creating conciliation and promoting peace, by recommending mutual forbearance." He then proceeds to give the following definition of candour:—"Candour, (says he) in its genuine scriptural import is, the treating the principles, actions, and characters of others as favourably as is consistent with what, after proper inquiry, we esteem truth and a good conscience." We will now measure Mr. O. by his own standard. One of his charges against the clergy on whom he sits in judgment, is founded on the loose principles of Dr. PALEY, relative to subscription to our Articles; another on his equally loose positions respecting Government. It is true with respect to the latter, Mr. O. does say, p. 251, "we charge no persons with the Doctor's sentiments, but those who professedly hold them. Some of our opponents, we know, as cordially disapprove them as we do." But if Mr. O. knew them, why did he not name them, that his reader might also know them? It may be asked, does it consist with Mr. O's definition of candour, to leave a general charge to indiscriminate application, by withholding the several cases which, he knows, furnish exceptions to it? My decided protest against Dr. PALEY's principles,

both religious and political, having been long before the world, gives me a right to put this question: But I proceed to examine those specimens which Mr. O. has produced, to shew, that on the score of candour I "have little ground for boast." P. 260. Mr. O., in p. 264, writes thus:—"Under a vast deal of pretensions to candour and gentlemanship, and brotherly kindness, it requires the utmost stretch of Mr. DAUBENY's charity to believe any professors of Christianity in a state of salvation, who differ from him in *external matters*; at the best, he maintains, they can only be left to the uncovenanted mercies of God." This is a style of writing, of which Mr. O. appears to be particularly fond; and with my consent, he shall have an exclusive patent for it. I confine myself to the matter it contains. The reference is to p. 178 of the Guide; where, speaking of the essential advantages attendant on communion with the church, and the disadvantages consequent upon a separation from it, I thus contrast them:—"In the Church, we have the sacraments of Christ's appointment, the seals of that covenant by which fallen man lays claim to eternal life; together with the ambassadors of Christ, whose sacred office it is to administer them. We have, moreover, the spirit of Christ accompanying his own ordinances; according to the promise made at the original establishment of his Church, that he would be with it always, even to the end of the world. On

the other hand, when you leave the Church, you leave the ministers and sacraments of Christ behind you. You may, indeed, appoint other ministers, and institute other sacraments ; but these ministers are not the ambassadors of Christ, nor are the sacraments they administer, the sacraments of Christ ; for the essence of an ambassador's office is, that he should be commissioned by the party whom he represents, and in whose name he acts ; and the essence of a covenant, of which the sacraments are seals, is, that it should be binding upon the party, in whose name it is made." The sacraments, from the first establishment of the Church to the present time, have been considered to be the seals of the Divine covenant. In this light they have been always seen by our Church, which has, on account of their essential importance, carefully provided for the right administration of them. In her Article she says, " they that receive baptism *rightly*, are grafted into the Church." In her Canons she says, that " no meetings, assemblies, or congregations of the King's born subjects, but those of the Established Church, may *rightly* challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful Churches." Now, unless the Church has been under a great mistake in this business from the beginning, the proper administration of the seal of the covenant has always been thought necessary to convey a title to the benefits of it. With Mr. O., however, it should seem, that the difference between

being *rightly* baptized and otherwise, that is, between having the seal of the covenant *rightly* applied or not, is a difference only "*in external matters.*" The Church of England considers baptism to be a sign of regeneration, of an inward and spiritual grace conveyed to the party: Mr. O. (as it has been already observed) represents it as "the bare admission into the Christian religion," p. 180; thereby degrading a sacrament into an "*external form,*" a beggarly element communicative of no benefit whatever. Whether Mr. O., therefore, baptizes, or his parish clerk; or whether persons are baptized in the Church or out of it; seems with him to be a difference only "*in external matters.*" This language might, indeed, be in character from an *irregular* preacher, who had jumped from the shop-board into the pulpit, with no authority but what he derived from his own self-sufficiency; but certainly was not to be expected from one of the appointed stewards of the Divine mysteries, who had received a regular commission for the purpose, in consequence of his solemn engagement, "so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same."\* And were the Church of England in convocation to sit in judgment on Mr. O.'s book, she could not, consistently with her appointed forms, consider the title prefixed to it, of "the true Church-

\* Office for the Ordering of Priests.



men ascertained," to be a title to which Mr. O. had manifested the best pretensions.

With respect to the impression intended to be made on his reader's mind, relative to a want of candour or charity in the author of the "Guide," the passage alluded to justifies no such conclusion. Sir RICHARD HILL had objected to the same passage, on which he thought proper to ground a coarse charge against me of "dealing out damnation by wholesale." To Sir RICHARD, who might not be acquainted with the language of the Primitive Church, some explanation was judged to be necessary. I therefore, in my seventh letter, write thus :—"The object of my book you will find to be the same which the Church had in view in the construction of her Articles and Canons; namely, to induce Christians to embrace that covenanted plan of salvation, which is offered to them by the ministers of the visible Church. Should Christians reject it, we lament the circumstance, but refrain from denouncing any sentence in the case." "But, Sir, when I say that the members of CHRIST'S visible Church, provided they are *faithful* members, are sure of salvation by virtue of the Gospel covenant; I do not say, that those who are not members are left without hope, or to make use of your own words, that salvation is withheld from them, merely because they are dissenters. God forbid." "Certain it is, that the conclusion you have drawn from the "Guide" (on this

subject) is ~~not~~ more foreign to my ideas, than it is inconsistent with that charity, which ought to mark the character of a Christian minister. I embrace, therefore, the opportunity you have given me of removing that false impression, which appears to have been made upon your mind relative to the present subject, and through you, it is probable, upon that of others; trusting that those persons who have attended to your heavy charge, will also attend to my vindication." P. 372. I trusted this might, because this ought to, have been the case. But Mr. O. does not wish that such false impressions should be removed; he therefore brings forward again the same passage, unaccompanied with the explanation that had been given to Sir RICHARD; and by way of confirming his reader's judgment, relative to that want of charity which the extract was supposed to establish, Mr. O. to his reference adds the convenient word *passim*, to convey the idea that such is the sentiment which Mr. D. in his writings *every where* maintains. Now had Mr. O. only directed the reader's attention to the 181st page of the "Guide," there could have been no mistake relative to the sense which I meant to express; namely, "that sense in which the Primitive Fathers are to be understood, when they say, that there is no salvation out of the Catholic Church. By which it meant, that there is no ~~common~~ *common* plan of salvation, save that which is addressed to ~~man~~, as a mem-

ber of that Church." The sense, therefore, meant to be conveyed did not relate so much to the state of salvation, in which those who are out of the Church may be, as to that covenanted title to salvation, which those who are in the Church actually possess; that sense which constituted the ground, on which the arguments so ably employed by the London divines, at the beginning of the last century, for the recovery of Dissenters to the Church of England, were chiefly built; but which the reader of Mr. O. may unfortunately conclude to have been employed about a difference only in *external matters*.

From this specimen, the Established Church may know what to expect from the ministers for whom Mr. O. apologizes, (supposing him to be their accredited representative) who, under the guise of candour and false charity, (for *true* charity is manifested in uniting, not in dividing, the Church) thus, in a manner, annihilate her ministry, and furnish a plea for separation from her connection, which the arguments of the best-informed divines will attempt in vain to counteract. I dwell no longer on this subject. Let the reader, let Mr. O. say, whether, with the above evidence before him, (and much more might easily be produced from my writings) attempting to leave such an injurious impression on his reader's mind, relative to my candour and charity, he is acting in conformity with the standard which he hath himself set up? Whether he is treating

the sentiments of the author of the "Guide," "as favourably as is consistent with what, after proper inquiry, he esteems *truth* and a *good conscience*?"

I proceed to the next specimen produced for the same purpose. "He would persuade his reader, (says Mr. O., speaking of the author of the "Guide") that he has qualified him to form a decided opinion on his subject by an appeal to historic fact; when this historic fact consists only of a few partial and sometimes wholly *inadmissible* extracts, and when the main body of legitimate and decisively contrary evidence on the point is not so much as glanced at."

P. 265. This bold charge, or rather unqualified assertion, as I conceive, proves not so much my want of candour or liberality of sentiment, as my incompetency for the subject I had undertaken, or my want of honesty in the management of it. But as my reader will, I trust, in this case, form an opinion for himself; and as I have not the least doubt what the opinion of every intelligent reader will be, when both Mr. OVERTON's evidence and mine on the subject shall be fairly before him; any attempt to lessen the force of Mr. O.'s language on this occasion would be but a waste of time. "*Valeat quantum valere potest.*"

Mr. O. thus proceeds:—"He details false and malignant representations of his opponents' sentiments, which are collected from the writings of professed scorners." P. 265. A respect for the

character of Sir RICHARD HILL induces me to wish, that this reference had been avoided; because it constrains me to repeat what I have said in my Fifth Letter to Sir RICHARD, on this particular point; "that the only fault in the representation under consideration was, that it was not quite strong enough for the subject to which it was applied." Appendix, p. 284. With the malignancy of the representation, or the propriety of Mr. O.'s application of the term *scorners*, I have no concern.

The next specimen produced, to prove my want of candour and liberality, runs thus:—"He almost constantly grounds his reasonings and conclusions upon consequences deduced from the doctrines, which they do not admit." P. 265. The reference is to "Appendix," p. 222; where I am speaking of the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination, as containing under it the absolute unconditional election of some persons, and the absolute reprobation of all others. Sir RICHARD HILL considered the latter part of this doctrine not the necessary consequence of the former part of it; and to get over the difficulty, he exchanges the obnoxious word *reprobation* for the softer term *preterition*. My argument proceeded on the ground, that these two parts of the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination being correlative, must be taken together; and the authority of CALVIN was brought forward to support it, "*Quia ergo DEUS preterit, reprobat.*" Mr. O. then, and

those for whom he speaks, admit, with Sir RICHARD, the doctrine of Calvinistic election, but do not admit the consequence of reprobation to be deducible from it. They do not perhaps see it. They are not, therefore, charged with it. So far, then, there is no breach of candour or liberality. But there would be a great defect both of judgment and duty in an author writing for the general information, were he, because Calvinists chance not to see the consequence deducible from their own doctrine, to neglect to point out that consequence to others not in the same state of mental blindness, in order to secure them against an error accompanied by such strange delusion.

The last specimen produced by Mr. O. is made up of scraps from different parts of my writings, and moulded into the following sentence:—"He charges them expressly with maintaining 'a religious system, consisting of human creatures without liberty, doctrines without sense, faith without reason, and a God without mercy; a system which teareth up the very foundation of religion, induceth all manner of profaneness in the world, and is the artifice of the Devil,' &c." P. 265. For the first part of this charge reference is made to p. 249 of the Appendix, where, in speaking of the doctrine of decrees, as described by Archbishop USHER, I say it is no other than *fatalism*; which was described by JORTIN to be a "religious system, consisting of human crea-

tures without liberty, doctrines without sense, faith without reason, and a God without mercy."

The next reference is to p. 81 of the "Guide," where, after having introduced the decisive judgment of ERASMUS on the same doctrine, I proceed thus:—"So long as it shall be maintained to be sound doctrine, that the true Saints of God, as they are called, may commit horrible and crying sins, die without repentance, and yet be sure of salvation, we ministers are called upon, by our office, to say, that such a doctrine is not of God, because it teareth up the very foundation of religion, induceth all manner of profaneness in the world, and is an artifice of that grand deceiver of mankind, whose object it ever will be to counteract, and, as much as in him lies, to render ineffectual the gracious plan of salvation, through the merits of a crucified Redeemer." The question therefore is, has the doctrine above described ever been professed in the world? Mr. O. knows that this has been, and it is to be feared still is, the case. To such doctrine, then, the foregoing language strictly applies, and I see no reason to change a letter of it. But when Mr. O. thinks fit to apply my general language to the particular condition of himself and his Calvinistic brethren, though, in such case, I am justified in saying to him "*de te fabula narratur*;" I must, at the same time, remind him, that he is the teller of the story, not the author of a "Guide to the Church."

From the foregoing specimens, expressly detailed for the purpose of proving my slender pretensions to candour or liberality of sentiment, Mr. O. draws the following inference, which shall be left, as it ought to be, to the judgment of my reader:—"So much reason has Mr. DAUBENY to thank God for his great attainments in candour, and the possession of a temper which will not suffer him to offend, or to speak harshly or disrespectfully of those who differ from him; with such propriety is this writer puffed off as a perfect model of these virtues." P. 265. Should my reader have given himself the trouble to go through Mr. OVERTON's section "concerning the standard of morals," he may think that Mr. O.'s publication would have done him more credit, if, in his treatment of his opponents, he had rather imitated Mr. DAUBENY's example.

It not being my intention to enter into the particular charges brought forward in this section, I pass on to p. 271, where, from premises that have been inconsiderately drawn, Mr. O. proceeds, in his accustomed manner, and in direct contradiction to the language in his Preface, to the following *indiscriminate* and *contrasted* conclusion.

"This, then, is the ground these divines have for congratulating themselves, suspecting the Church, and censuring us, in regard to the *rule of morals*. We, in strict adherence to our guide, prescribe a *perfect standard*, even the whole moral law of God.



Perfect conformity in heart and conduct to this law, we maintain, is the duty of all men; and after this conformity, they ought continually to labour. *They*, in the stead of this, substitute some vague and indeterminate rule of conduct, which they call *sincerity*. *They* insist not upon the *conversion* and *renovation* of the heart in those who have been educated Christians. *They* account little of the immediate duties of the whole first table of the law, or allow them only a secondary importance. *They* censure us for our strictness in regard to what chiefly concerns a *man's self*, and tolerate various kinds of public dissipation. And so far are they from being strict on those branches of morality, into which they nearly resolve the whole of it, on the *relative* and *social* virtues; so lax are the notions of some of them on the duties of subjects to their governors, and of ministers to their people; so little reason have they for boasting, with respect to the virtues of veracity, candour, and charity." P. 217. And with a view of putting a finishing stroke to the caricature he had taken so much pains to draw, lest his brother clergy should still not be seen in a sufficiently deformed point of view, Mr. O. applies the strong language of Bishop HORSELEY to their case, by which his reader is given to understand, that by a *moral man* is meant nothing more than that "he is no murderer, no adulterer, no thief, no liar, no spendthrift." Yet this, proceeds Mr. O., is the morality, concerning

which we hear such a continual boast! These are the *good works* which are to contribute so much towards obtaining heaven and immortality." P. 272.

As Mr. O. has not produced a single passage to prove, that such are the *good works* recommended by the author of "a Guide to the Church," as those, for the performance of which CHRIST came into the world, "to purify unto himself a peculiar people;" it is not necessary to dwell on this part of Mr. O.'s publication. It is to be lamented, that any minister of the Church of England should have suffered his zeal so far to annihilate his charity, and destroy his judgment, as to have been able to write it. Those gentlemen, whose names are introduced into this section, would think it impertinent in me to say a syllable in their defence; knowing that a charge thus *libelously* drawn, and thus *indiscriminately* applied, answers itself, and can bring disgrace on no one, so much as on the person who drew it. For my own part, my object in answering Mr. O.'s book having been, not so much to defend myself against his uncharitable attack, as to maintain, what I understand to be, the genuine doctrines of the Church of England, more particular attention to the contents of this section would be time thrown away; and considering that no man can speak long of himself without sin or folly, my reply to Mr. O., on the general subject of *this section*, shall be comprehended in the following short sentence. My writings, my

character, and my professional conduct, are before the world; should the world be indisposed to give me that credit for either, which their intention at least should secure, I thank God, I can look forward, "through faith and patience," from this world to the next, unto that Master whose servant I am, and "to whom I stand or fall."

## SECTION II.

### *Concerning the Sanctions of Morality.*

ON the subject to which this Section principally refers, so much has at different times been said and written, as to render the saying or writing any thing new or even instructive upon it a hopeless undertaking. The great object in view, therefore, in handling it must be, not to add to the many pages that have been already written, so much as to compress what occasion may require to be still said, within the least intelligible compass.

With this object I enter upon the present section; in my treatment of which, I shall confine myself, as much as possible, to the analysis of the argument which Mr. O. has employed, together with the evidence which he has adduced. All the advantage

that might be gained in the judgment of some readers, by the use of *sneering* and *supercilious* language, is utterly disclaimed. It is not the language of the gentleman; much less should it disgrace the page of the divine. However Mr. O. and myself may differ in opinion, we have each a right to be treated, as Ministers of the Church of CHRIST ought to treat each other. Such treatment it has not, indeed, been my lot always to experience; still of my deficiency on this head no brother Clergyman, I trust, will ever have cause to complain; for though zeal may not at all times be accompanied with competent knowledge, still zeal, when *sincere*, is entitled to respect. Mr. O.'s arguments and mine, therefore, on the much-controverted subject of faith and works, shall be left to their own weight in the reader's mind, whose office it is to determine fairly and impartially, which most strictly correspond with the language of Scripture, with the sentiments of our Reformers, and the doctrine of our Church.

Mr. O. opens this section with the short statement of the point, which it was his principal object in a former Chapter to maintain, namely, that "good works are neither the *meritorious* cause nor the *appointed condition* of justification." The first part of this position constitutes no subject of controversy in the Church at present; and that the latter branch of it should be objectionable, appears to me irreconcilable with the consideration, that

the conditions in question are conditions of God's making. As such they are not an encroachment on Divine grace on the part of man, (the ground on which objection to them has been built) so much as an extension of that grace on the part of God. Now if the conditions annexed to the free gift of God through CHRIST, are calculated to render man, what he otherwise would not be, fit to be a partaker of the gift, they must be considered as an additional manifestation of that loving-kindness, from which the gift itself originally proceeded; because they are a merciful provision, on the part of the Benefactor, for the security of the benefit to the parties for whom it was designed. In this light *conditions* of salvation have ever appeared to me; considering that the same all-gracious Being, who made those conditions, has engaged, provided man be not wanting to himself, to enable him to perform them. That *good works* are an *appointed condition* of justification, the reader has seen proved, both by the language of Scripture and the doctrine of our Church; at the same time that the error entertained by Mr. O. on this subject was traced to his misapplication of the Eleventh Article. This ground then having been cleared, I pass on to the leading subject of the present section, which appears to have been written, partly at least, for the purpose of maintaining a doctrine *originally* advanced, if I mistake not, by the celebrated Mrs. MORE.

The grand position laid down by Mr. O. *in limine* is this :—That “ our Church secures the interests and inculcates the necessity of morality, by considering good works the *natural fruit* and *necessary effect* of that faith which justifieth.” P. 273. To inculcate the necessity of morality by *proper argument*; is one thing; but to inculcate the necessity of morality, by shewing that it must *naturally* and *necessarily* take place, appears to me an unnecessary undertaking. On this point, however, Mr. O. observes, our Church “ is most full and decisive.” To prove this, various extracts are made from the Homilies on Faith and Salvation, and our Twelfth Article, calculated to determine the nature of *true* faith, in contra-distinction to that which is *false* and consequently vain; by which the reader is to understand generally, from the words of our Article, that “ good works are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification,” and from the language of the Homily, that “ where these fruits do not follow, men are destitute of the *true* faith, and that if they pretend to have it, they deceive themselves, mock God, and manifestly shew, that they know not what *true* faith meaneth.”\* To this language of our Articles and Homilies is added the distinction made by the Apostles St. PAUL and St. JAMES between a *right*, a *perfect* faith, and a *dead*, *devilish*

\* Homily on Faith.

faith; illustrated by the allusion to be found in the Homily on this subject, of “a *dead* man not being a man.” To this evidence, in support of his position, Mr. O. adds that of CRANMER, NOWELL, the Martyrs in Queen MARY’s days, and to come down to the present time, that of the Bishop of LINCOLN; all of whom speak of faith as always accompanied with a *disposition to obedience* and *good works* as the necessary consequence of sincere faith in CHRIST.” P. 275. Mr. O. then proceeds to point out the reasons, why faith is ever productive of obedience: because “true believers in CHRIST, on believing, become united to CHRIST, as the branches are to the vine; and, through the continued exercise of faith, derive from him strength and nourishment, and whatever is requisite for the support of the spiritual life.” Hence the Church concludes (or rather Mr. O. concludes for her, for the Church nowhere, that I know of, has so concluded for herself) that “in the *nature of things* it is impossible it should be otherwise, but that the principles of the Gospel really embraced must be *operative*.”\* P. 276.

The foregoing evidence Mr. O. thus sums up in the strong language of our Article and Homily:—“In short,” says he, “our Church teaches most undeniably, that ‘good works do spring out *necessarily*

\* Mr. O. does not mark this conclusion of our Church as a *quotation*; but refers to the Homily on Salvation for his authority, though it contains no language to justify *such* conclusion.

of a true and lively faith;’ that ‘good living cannot be separated from true faith;’ that ‘as the light cannot be hid, but will shew itself at one place or another, so a *true* faith cannot be kept secret, but will shew itself by works;’ and that ‘as the living body of a man exerciseth such things, as belong to a natural and living body, even so the soul that hath a lively faith in it, will be doing always some good work, which shall declare that it is living, and will not be unoccupied.” P. 277.

Such is the ground on which Mr. O.’s position, “that *good works* are the *natural fruit* and *necessary effect* of that faith which justifieth,” stands. In placing the prominent parts of it before my reader, my wish has been to do it full justice, previous to my laying before him the judgment, which Mr. O. has passed on those parts of my writings which bear on this subject.

Having thus established what he considers to be the decisive doctrine of our Church, Mr. O. proceeds to state, that, “in defiance of all this, a writer, professing the greatest candour and fairness, and whose knowledge on the subject is represented as nearly unparalleled, would persuade the world, that to represent true faith ‘as necessarily’ productive of good works,’ is certainly not the doctrine of the Church of England, &c.” P. 277. But instead of suffering his reader to enter fairly into my argument, and judge for himself, Mr. O. gives a bias to his



mind by telling him, in that confident style of writing by which his book is distinguished, "that to say what Mr. D.'s sentiments on this point are, would, perhaps, exceed the skill of man." P. 277. Perhaps, after the specimen of Mr. O.'s skill exhibited in this publication, the reader may be inclined to doubt whether Mr. O.'s be quite the standard, by which the extent of the human capacity should be measured. But as these *littleneffes*, in which Mr. O. seems rather to delight, attach to the man more than to the cause, I pass on.

After this handsome opening, Mr. O. lays before the reader his analysis of my doctrine, at least so far, we understand, as he possesses skill to comprehend it:—"Thus, then, those persons, Mr. D. says, who affirm that where *true* faith is, there will be repentance, obedience, and holiness of life, have always appeared to him to confound, rather than to explain, the Christian doctrine. To affirm this, Mr. D. conceives, is in other words to say, that when the foundation is well laid, it will of itself raise the superstructure; or, to make use of another scripture allusion, when the root of the tree is planted in CHRIST, Christian fruit will be the consequent produce of the branches." "This, Mr. D. adds to Mrs. MORE, is to say, in your words, that there is an *indivisible* union between the doctrines and duties of Christianity, or that the latter grow out of the former, as the *natural* and *necessary* productions of such a living

root. But, Madam, he subjoins, this, is not the language either of the scripture, or of the Church of England. Faith, which you compare to a living root, may live without being productive, &c." P. 278.

To this statement of my doctrine Mr. O. subjoins the following definitive conclusion:—"It is beyond all question then, from hence, that the faith, which Mr. D. denies to be necessarily productive, is not the counterfeit, dead, devilish faith, of which our Church speaks, and which, she says, is not *properly* called faith, and is not faith; but the "*right*," "*true*," "*genuine*," "*living*," "Christian faith;" faith considered "as the first radical principle of the Holy Spirit;" faith, as further explained by himself, as it is "the good work which the grace of God" effects; as it implies "a firm belief in CHRIST;" a reliance on the promises of God through CHRIST;" faith, in short, of the *very kind*, and distinguished by the *very epithets*, with that which the Church maintains is *necessarily* productive. His discordancy with her must therefore appear undeniable." P. 279.

On the face of Mr. O.'s page such does certainly appear to be the case; and were it not my wish to forgo all harsh expressions, they certainly would not here be out of place. But contenting myself with stating facts, I leave the sentence to be pronounced by my reader.

Indeed did I think my reader would either give himself the trouble, or had it in his power, to follow Mr. O. through the several references, from which, taken together, he has thought fit to draw his definitive conclusion, I should not take up his time by entering in detail into the evidence that has been adduced. But circumstanced as he probably may be, it would neither be doing justice to him nor myself, were I to omit to probe this conclusion to the bottom.

The judgment passed by Mr. O. is this; that according to my heterodox doctrine as here summed up, "*the right,*" "*true,*" "*genuine,*" &c. &c. The words, "*right,*" "*true,*" "*genuine,*" "*living,*" "*Christian faith,*" "*the good works which the grace of God,*" "*a firm belief in CHRIST,*" and "*a reliance on the promises of God in CHRIST,*" are printed in italics, and marked as extracts from different parts of my writings. The reader is thereby led to conclude, that by appeal to my writings Mr. O.'s judgment stands confirmed. Whether it really be so or not, he is now called upon to determine. That I may do justice to Mr. O. on this occasion, it is admitted that one part of the charge here brought forward by him has been substantiated—so far as my language carries, *on the face of it*, an appearance of discordancy with that applied by the Church to this subject. I say, in p. 291 of the "Guide," "that the persons to whom I immediately allude, appeared to

confound, rather than to explain the Christian doctrine, by representing faith as comprehensive of all Christian duties. Where *true faith* is, there they tell you, will be repentance, obedience, and holiness of life, &c." By placing this language in immediate opposition to that of our Article, which says, that good works necessarily spring out of a *true* and *lively* faith, an evident discordancy appears; and, taking the above sentence separately, it may be supposed, that the author of it is writing in opposition to the doctrine of the Church. On this account, and to avoid misconstruction, the epithet *true* ought certainly not to have had a place in my page, and I thank Mr. O. for the opportunity afforded me of correcting my language; at the same time I plead, that had the language of the Twelfth Article presented itself to my mind at the time, I should certainly have avoided this *apparent* opposition to it. If my reader, however, will take the trouble to refer to the page in question, he will find that Mr. O. has not made a fair report of the sense in which the phrase "*true faith*" (inadmissible as it is) was meant to be understood. The persons to whom allusion was made, were those who occasionally separate from the Church, with the view of hearing a purer Gospel than what, they say, is to be heard in the Church. The Gospel they generally hear, I complained of as not being a *perfect* system of Christianity; faith and obedience not being properly

connected in it, and consequently the *whole truth*, as it is in Christ Jesus, not being delivered. After having observed that error on either side is fatal, I allude to those persons who appear to lay too great a stress on faith, considered as comprehensive of all Christian duties. Then follows the passage in which the phrase "*true faith*," the present subject of Mr. O.'s censure, occurs. On reference to my page it must be obvious to my reader, that *true faith* could not be here meant in the same sense in which it is placed in our Twelfth Article, but only as a *true belief in*, and *firm reliance on*, the promises of God in CHRIST, and that my reasoning turned on this sort of faith, considered as comprehending the whole substance of Christianity. It was not, therefore, of *perfect* faith, that faith to which the epithets *true* and *lively* are annexed in the Twelfth Article, that I was speaking, but of faith *abstractedly* considered, as I afterwards explain it; namely, of *true faith*, with reference only to the *truth* of the doctrines believed. Not that the propriety of my language is to be maintained *even in this sense*; for, upon more mature consideration, I think the phrase "*true faith*" should be literally restrained to that use to which it has been appropriated by our Church. At the same time it may be observed, in justification of my language, that I say *true faith* only; whereas the Church in her Article refuses to use *true* by itself, but couples with it the epithet *lively*, as the

essential and distinguishing feature of the right faith; meaning thereby particularly to express its *productiveness*; for in the next member of the sentence it is observable, the Church drops the epithet *true*, and uses *lively* only. To take away, however, all doubt, with respect to the sense in which the phrase was used by me on this occasion, in the same page where it is found, the following passage occurs, which plainly delivers my meaning, and in which the obnoxious epithet is omitted:—"To say that faith, *by which is understood a firm belief in CHRIST* as the whole and sole cause of salvation, will secure to man the possession of all those graces and virtues necessary to adorn his Christian profession, is, in other words, to say, that when the foundation is well laid, it will of itself raise the superstructure, &c."

Now this latter sentence, as it could not have escaped the notice of Mr. O., should have been taken into the account, previous to his pronouncing judgment on its author. Taking, then, my whole page together, as belonging to the same subject, my reader will probably think, that if there has been any want of correctness in expression on my part, (and I believe few authors write so correctly, as not to have occasion to give up an epithet) there certainly has not been manifested, in this instance, any superabundance of candour on that of Mr. OVERTON.

Proceed we now to examine the other grounds, on which Mr. O.'s judgment on this head has been

built. The words, "*right*," "*genuine*," "*living*," "*Christian faith*," being marked as words *separately* taken, not as found in connection in any given sentence, prove nothing more than that such words are to be met with in different parts of my writings; information of which my reader could hardly stand in need. The first sentence, or rather mutilated part of a sentence, to which Mr. O. annexes a reference, will be found in p. 52 of my Letter to Mrs. H. MORE. Mr. O. introduced this subject with observing, that "it would perhaps exceed the skill of man to say what my sentiments on this subject were." The page, therefore, from the Letter to Mrs. MORE, from which the present extract has been taken, is laid before my reader for his determination, whether the language contained in it be intelligible or not:—"Faith in CHRIST will certainly be productive of the fruits of Christianity, when the professor has not been wanting to himself in the diligent and faithful use of the means that have been instituted for that purpose. But it is no uncommon thing for ignorant Christians to expect the fruits of Divine grace, without making use of the means of it; and this is downright enthusiasm. When such persons who have been accustomed to talk of their waiting God's time, in the expectation that more is to be done for them in the work of salvation than the tenor of the Christian covenant authorizes them to expect, are told, that the duties

of Christianity are the *natural* and *necessary* production of its doctrines; such information must tend to confirm their prejudice, and in conformity with it lead them to hope, that those fruits of faith will, in due time, be produced in them, which they, as moral agents, ought to have been instrumental in producing in themselves; in correspondence with that most erroneous idea, that the good work of faith which the grace of God had begun in them, would not be left uncompleted.”\*

My reader will not readily find out how this passage could furnish Mr. O. with authority for saying, that according to my doctrine “the *true, lively, Christian* faith, that good work which the grace of God effects, is not necessarily productive.” But it is only to keep the author’s meaning on the occasion out of sight, and to his words, “the good work of faith which the grace of God,” to add the single word “*effects*,” and the business is completed: So that what I applied against the erroneous notion entertained by some weak Christians, “that the good work of faith which the grace of God has begun in them,” will, at all events, not fail to be completed, in Mr. O.’s edition of my words runs thus—that “Christian faith, the good work which the grace of God effects, is not necessarily productive of good works.” Now it will occur to every intelligent reader, that faith, “that good work which

\* Letter to Mrs. HANNAH MORE, p. 51, 52.



the grace of God effects," cannot fail of being productive of its proper fruit, so long as the grace of God continues to act upon it. But the author was speaking of the error of those Christians who take it for granted, that because the good work of faith has been *begun* in them by the grace of God, the therefore it could not fail to be *completed*. This much for Mr. O.'s first reference.

His second is to be found in p. 292 of the "Guide." With the view of discriminating between "faith when in its perfect state, accompanied with its correspondent effects, and faith *abstractedly considered*," as a mere reliance or dependance on CHRIST. I proceed thus:—"To say that faith, by which is understood a *firm belief in CHRIST* as the whole and sole cause of salvation, will secure to man the possession of all those graces and virtues necessary to adorn his Christian profession, is in other words to say, that when the foundation is well laid, it will of itself raise the superstructure; or, to make use of another scripture allusion, where the root of the tree is planted in CHRIST, Christian fruit will be the consequent produce of the branches. But in this case facts are against us." Guide, p. 292. It must be obvious, that the position laid down in the foregoing passage is, that professional faith and perfect faith, did not mean the same thing; and that *the firm belief in CHRIST*, which conveys to the professing party his original interest in the merits of CHRIST,

did not *of itself* produce those future corresponding effects, required to "make his calling and election sure." Whereas, according to Mr. O.'s edition of my words, I am made to say, that "*a firm faith in CHRIST,*" considered as synonymous with *true, genuine, living, Christian faith*, (to which I was purposely opposing it) is not necessarily productive of good works. The same idea, therefore, which accompanied the examination of Mr. O.'s first reference, will again present itself to my reader here; namely, that *true, genuine, living, Christian faith*, in the sense in which those words are used by our Church, whilst through Divine grace it continues in that state, cannot fail of producing its proper fruits. By turning to the 166th page of the "Appendix," he will also know, that such was my sentiment on the subject, where the following answer is made to a similar objection from Sir R. HILL:—"The passages you have cited from the Articles and Homilies, say no more than what I have already again and again avowed, that *true lively Christian faith* must produce good works; for if it did not, it would not be entitled to that distinction, &c." Consequently, Mr. O. must have known that by "*a firm faith in CHRIST,*" in the passage under consideration in the "Guide," I could not mean that *true, lively, genuine, Christian faith*, on which misrepresentation of my language the charge of my discordancy with the Church is partly built.

Mr. O.'s third reference is to be found in p. 164, 163, of the "Appendix." The passage to which it belongs, runs thus:—"If faith be taken for that *honest vital principle*, for which, in the Christian sense, it ought to be taken, it must of course produce those fruits which are here described; it would not be *true faith*, if it did not."—But, Sir, as men are always deceiving and being deceived, we must accommodate our language to their condition. For which reason, a certain discrimination has been necessary in the use of the word faith; in order to prevent *nominal* Christians from making a *mere* reliance on the promises of God through CHRIST, (which may, in some sense, be called Faith) usurp the place of that Evangelical principle, which can alone be effectual to salvation." It will readily be perceived, that the writer had precisely the same object in view in the foregoing passage, that he had in those to which the attention of my reader has been already directed; namely, to discriminate between *professional* and *true Christian faith*; and thereby to prevent "a *mere reliance on CHRIST* from superseding that diligent attention to spiritual concerns, necessary to render the man of God perfect, and meet to be "a partaker with the saints in light."

It may not, probably, at first sight occur to my reader, how this passage can be brought to minister to Mr. O.'s purpose. But to make use of the language of another strenuous advocate for Mrs.

MORE, "We often wonder, after we have been let into the secret, at the simple means, by which great effects are produced." And what can be more simple than the method by which Mr. O. has accomplished his work on this occasion? The little significant word *mere*, to be found in the original passage, was so decidedly distinctive, as to be totally incompatible with the language Mr. O. chose the author should speak. It was only therefore silently dropping this little, though important monosyllable out of the author's text, and "a reliance on the promises of GOD through CHRIST," considered as differently descriptive of the *true, genuine, lively Christian* faith, (to which the passage, as it stands in the original, was meant to be opposed) then says, just what it appears to be Mr. O.'s object on this occasion that it should say.—"A *mere* reliance on the promises of GOD through CHRIST," applies exclusively to the *nominal* professor of Christianity. But the distinctive word *mere* being thrown out of the sentence, "a reliance on the promises of GOD through CHRIST," considered as synonymous with *true, living, Christian* faith," applies as exclusively to the real Christian, "thoroughly furnished unto every good word and work." The language, therefore, which *in my page* was purposely designed to describe the *vain* reliance of the *nominal* professor, by a little simple contrivance *in his*, Mr. O. has represented to mean the well-

grounded reliance of the faithful Christian. "*Es disconvenit.*"

Such are the means employed to substantiate the charge of my discordancy with the Church. And by similar means, by picking words and scraps of sentences, from different parts of my writings, and tacking them together *ad libitum*, with the convenient aid of mutilation and misrepresentation, Mr. O. might, as it has been already observed, make me responsible for the grossest blasphemy. Now, though I am answerable for a conclusion fairly deducible from my own premises, still I certainly am not so, after my premises shall have passed through a distorting medium. In the present case it should seem, that without misrepresentation the language of the author would not have furnished subject for objection.

But Mr. O. here seems hardly to be aware of the danger of *proving too much*. For with the view of destroying entirely the credit of the writer, Mr. O. represents him as, *totidem verbis*, contradicting himself on the present subject, by bringing forward the following passages from the "Appendix:"—"I have, Mr. D. says, again and again avowed, that *true lively Christian faith must produce good works*; for if it did not, it would not be entitled to that distinction." "Again; if faith, he says, be taken for that *honest vital principle*, for which, in the Christian sense, it ought to be taken, it *must of course* produce those fruits which are here described; it would

not be *true faith*, if it did not." To which Mr. O. adds, "This Mr. D. is the precise proposition you undertake to correct, and wherefore then all your toil?" P. 279.

The precise position objected to in Mrs. MORE's publication was this—That the "duties which grow out of the doctrines of Christianity, are to be considered as the *natural* and *necessary* productions of such a living root;" or, as Mr. O. expresses it, that "good works are the *natural* fruit and *necessary* effect of that faith which justifieth." Now the proposition, "that true lively Christian faith (whilst in that state) must produce good works;" and the proposition, that "good works are the *natural* and *necessary* effect of that faith which justifieth;" do not appear to me to be the same: and on this ground my objection to Mrs. MORE's language was built. But this point shall be discussed in its proper place. For the present, I observe, that the toil on this occasion seems to have been, not so much on my side, as on that of Mr. O.; who appears to have been at the trouble of ransacking my publications, to furnish materials for the construction of a sentence according to his own fancy, for the purpose of bringing forward a sentence of my own construction in decided hostility to it; first making me say what I certainly did not mean to say, in order that, by afterward producing what I really do say, "one of the first writers of the age," as Mr. O. sincerely

calls me, may appear on this occasion to contradict himself. But surely this must be considered as exhibiting a specimen of Mr. O.'s manner of quoting and proving, (to which it belongs to my reader to affix the epithet) rather than of the inconsistency of the author meant to be exposed by it; and if Mr. O. can reconcile such conduct with the language of his Preface, the ideas he annexes to some words must be so different from mine, that it is scarcely to be expected that there should be, on almost any subject, a concurrence of opinion between us.

But it is not sufficient to point out the method here taken to sink the character of my writings; it is moreover necessary, after the confusion that has been introduced into a very simple subject, to convince my reader, that my ideas upon it, however unintelligible to Mr. O., were clear and precise.

Every writer ought to be understood according to the most obvious sense of the language he adopts; but should the terms he employs not be the best chosen, or most critically adapted to his subject, still, if they are capable, in consequence of the consistency of the writer's language, of conveying his ideas to the world, every candid reader will give him credit, if not for his style, at least for his meaning; and I cannot help thinking, that were Mr. O. as disposed to understand my writings, as he seems desirous of misrepresenting them, he would find no difficulty in drawing from them a sound and consistent sense: at the

same time I feel no such attachment to particular modes of expression, as to prevent my ready adoption of any correction, that may tend to make my ideas more easily intelligible. So far, then, as my management of the present subject may be rendered more clear and satisfactory by my answer to Mr. Q.'s objections, I have to thank him for the opportunity afforded me for that purpose.

The merits of a crucified Redeemer constitute the grand hinge on which the salvation of man turns. To gain an interest in those merits, man must possess faith as his necessary qualification; for it is but consistent with reason, that he who expects to be saved by CHRIST, must first firmly believe in him as the author of his salvation. Hence it is, and with a particular view to counteract the erroneous doctrine of Romish merit, that so much is said of faith by our Reformers;\* as if the whole work of salvation, so far as man is concerned in it, turned upon it. On this account we are said to be "justified by *faith only*, because faith sends us directly to CHRIST for remission of sins, and that by faith given us of God we embrace the promise of God's mercy, and of the remission of our sins, (which thing none other of our virtues or works properly doth); *therefore* the scripture useth to say, that *faith without*

\* "This saying, that we be justified by faith only, freely, and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works, &c."—*Homily on Salvation*, p. 16.



works doth justify." The word *therefore* is here emphatical—"Therefore the scripture useth to say"—not because the fact is so, but for the reason just assigned; it *is so said*; for the Homily expressly declareth, "that the doctrine, that we be justified freely by faith in CHRIST only, is not that this our faith in CHRIST, which is in us, doth justify us;" it being elsewhere said that "we are justified freely, renouncing the merit of all our said virtues of *faith*, hope, charity," &c. "Nevertheless, this sentence, that we be justified by *faith only*, is not meant that the said justifying faith is *alone* in man," without repentance, hope, and charity, &c. When our Reformers, therefore, said, that "we be justified freely," they meant not that we should or might be afterward idle, and that nothing should be *required* on our parts afterward; accordingly they spake of "a true and lively faith bringing forth good works, and a life according to God's commandments, as *required for our salvation*."—*Homily on Salvation*. Hence faith, thus understood, is called by St. IGNATIUS "the beginning or the principle of man's Christian life." From whence it follows, that any mistake on this subject cannot fail to draw after it the most serious consequences, since the security of the whole Christian superstructure depends on this foundation-stone in CHRIST being firmly laid. Considering, therefore, the enemy we have to deal with, it is not to be wondered at, that where he

cannot succeed in his first object, of rendering this foundation-stone of the Christian building a stone of stumbling and rock of offence, his next object should be to render it as useless as possible, by inducing those who are not to be prevented from building upon it, to build upon it in an unsafe manner. To counteract this grand and fatal deception, which commenced with the first preaching of the Gospel, and which will more or less prevail to the end, has been, and must continue to be, the chief employment of the Christian minister. Such was the important object St. JAMES had in view in his Epistle; and the method employed by him for the purpose was, pointing out the necessary distinction between that faith which was, and that faith which was not, available to salvation; and fixing the standard by which the quality of the former, the *true Christian* faith, was to be ascertained. The object of our Reformers, in their Homily on this subject, with a direct eye to the error of the Solidians and Antinomians of their day, was precisely the same. After the example of St. JAMES, though with more laboured minuteness, they drew a contrast between false and true faith; and, as it might be supposed, considering the enormity and dangerous nature of the error which they were combating, when warm upon their subject, with the view of marking with the strongest pencil the distinction so necessary to be kept in view, they made use of the

most decided language; describing faith without works not only as false, devilish faith, and unavailable to salvation, “but as a *dead faith*, and *no faith at all*, even as a dead man is not aman.”—*Homily*, p. 22. In conformity with this strong figurative language, our Church (we are told by Mr. O., p. 279) speaks of this false dead faith “*as not properly called faith, and that it is not faith.*” It does not occur to me where our Church speaks thus; but I certainly know where our Reformers speak the very opposite language. The Homily on Faith sets out with informing the reader that “there are two kinds of faith spoken of in Scripture; one of which is called *dead faith*, on account of its being barren and unfruitful. But *this faith* consisting “in a persuasion and belief in man’s heart, whereby he knoweth that there is a God, and agreeth unto all the truth of God’s most holy word contained in Scripture, (the Reformers say) *is properly called faith.*”—*Homily*, p. 21. At the same time our Reformers proceed to say, that though a man under such circumstances, as a believer of all the promises of God, may be said to have a faith; yet that is not such a faith whereby he may surely look for grace and salvation. From whence it is certainly to be concluded, that the strong figurative language employed by them on this subject was not meant to be received in a *literal* sense, but only to express, in the most *forcible* terms, the *absolute inutility* of that species of faith, which

did not come up to the prescribed Christian standard: They did not mean to say, for instance, that *mere* professional faith was *no faith at all*; for if they had, they would have contradicted their own position; but that, on account of its being that kind of nominal faith, which was unavailable to salvation, it was, to *all saving purpose*, as no faith at all. Nor did they mean that the analogy between faith and works, represented as *dead faith*, and a dead man as *no man*, held in the strict sense of it, but so far only as it applied to faith, when in a *state of useless inactivity*: For they knew that the dead faith of the nominal professor was not so *literally* dead, as to be incapable of being raised into action through the operation of the appointed means of grace; whereas the dead man is a corpse, from which, in the order of nature, all capability of action has perfectly departed. So that the conclusion to be drawn from their language is, that “this dead (because inactive) faith is not the sure and substantial faith which saveth sinners;” but that other faith spoken of in Scripture, “which is not (as the aforesaid faith) idle, unfruitful, dead, but worketh by charity. Which, as the other *vain faith* is called a *dead faith*, so may this be called (according to the same figurative mode of speech) a quick, or lively faith.”\*

From marking this striking distinction between these two kinds of faith, our Reformers proceed, in

\* Homily on Faith, p. 22.

the same figurative language, to point out the standard, by which the genuine quality of *true lively* faith is to be ascertained; by giving the reader to understand, "that this faith doth not lie dead in the heart, but is lively and fruitful in bringing forth good works; that as the living body of a man is ever exercised in such things as belong to a natural living body, even so the soul that hath a lively faith in it, will be doing always some good work, and that good cannot be separated from it."†

In correspondence with which figurative language our Article says, that "good works do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a *lively* faith may be as evidently known, as a tree is discerned by the fruit."\* From which figurative language the conclusion evidently meant to be drawn was this:—not that the regular process of nature, in carrying on the functions of a living body, presented an exact counterpart to *lively* faith carrying on its spiritual operations in the soul; but that where *lively* faith had actually taken possession of the human soul, there a general disposition to

† Homily on Faith, p. 22, 24.

\* The figure here made use of appears to me more than commonly correct, and strikingly corroborative of my position:—The tree (*faith*) is still a tree, whether it produce fruit or not; but the good tree (*lively faith*) is necessarily productive of fruits, (good works.) So that as fruit is the only evidence by which the goodness of the tree is discerned, in like manner by its necessary produce of good works alone can we know that any man's faith is true and *lively*.

love and obedience would be found; and that so long as this faith continued in a *lively* state, it must necessarily be productive of its correspondent effects, even as a fruitful tree, *whilst in that state*, must necessarily produce fruit.

That there might, therefore, be no possible deception on this important subject, it was the object of our Reformers to convince those, who talked of or hoped for salvation through faith in CHRIST, that their faith must necessarily be productive of good works; because as good works constituted the characteristic distinction of that lively faith which was alone available to salvation, where that faith really existed, it could not otherwise be, but that good works must necessarily accompany it. And so important was this distinction in the eyes of our Reformers, that, as it were for the express purpose of guarding against the perversion of indiscriminating minds, nothing in the Twelfth Article is attributed to true faith *only*.

In conformity with the manner in which this important subject was treated by our Reformers, is that in which it was meant to appear in my writings. To this end, faith was considered both in an *abstract* and *concrete* sense, according to the distinction marked down in the "Homily"—faith, as it consists of a persuasion or belief in man's heart relative to salvation, built on the promises of God, which our Reformers say, *is properly called faith*; and faith, "in

its full and finished state as made perfect by works." "Guide," p. 302. In other words, "faith, as comprehensive of all Christian duties," and as such, available to salvation.

The distinction between faith taken in an *abstract* and in a *concrete* sense is, it is presumed, intelligible to every reader competent to understand the meaning of those terms, though Mr. O. affects not to comprehend it; "What are we to understand (says he) by faith in the *concrete*?" But as the answer precedes the question in the following plain definition, "faith in the concrete, or faith with all the necessary ingredients, of which it must be composed to characterize its genuine quality;" I really cannot bring myself to pay Mr. O. so bad a compliment, as to suppose him incapable of understanding it. "But," continues Mr. O., "did Mr. D. ever hear of *true* faith composed of any other ingredients?" Certainly not. But though Mr. D. never heard of *true lively* faith, composed of other ingredients than those which properly belong to it as such, still he has heard of *faith* destitute of those ingredients; and it was between these two different heads of faith, that it was the object of Mr. D.'s language on this occasion to discriminate. "Then the doctrine of our Church is, (concludes Mr. O.) that faith, when considered as comprehensive of good works, is necessarily productive of those works." If such be not the doctrine of the Church of England, in what sense

does Mr. O. understand the expression, "*lively faith*?" By *lively faith* has been always understood *operative* faith; faith abounding in good works, or comprehensive of good works; for the language is fynonymous. Out of this *lively* faith, then, according to the doctrine of the Twelfth Article, good works do necessarily spring and must continue to spring, so long as faith remains in that *lively* state. If, then, there be any distinguishing mark of acuteness, or of logical precision in Mr. O.'s reasoning on this subject, they must be left to be appreciated by my reader; on me they are lost, for I see little else but a multiplication of words, unproductive of increased knowledge.

Mr. O. must know that our Reformers, both in the Homily and Article, when speaking of the faith available to salvation, do not make use simply of the general term *faith*, but accompany it with the epithets of *true, lively, right*; for the evident purpose of characterizing its peculiar quality. Aware that so much depended on a proper meaning being annexed to the word faith, convinced of the truth of the axiom, *dolus latet in generalibus*, and knowing at the same time the deceitfulness of the human heart, their object was to analyze and particularize as much as possible; that the distinction between *wrong* and *right* faith might be so clearly established in the mind of the Christian professor, as to leave no room for any other than wilful mistake on this subject.



This necessary distinction, the page in Mr. O.'s book now before us seems calculated to put out of sight, by confounding what it was my object clearly to discriminate. In discussions of importance, where definitions are absolutely necessary to determine the precise meaning of the writer, and so much depends on accuracy and correctness, general terms should be avoided, because they too often prove a shelter for deception. Every reader knows, that the word faith, in an *abstract* sense, means a belief of, or reliance on, the word or promises of another. Christian faith, therefore, taken in *this* sense, must mean a belief of, or reliance on, the words and promises of GOD IN CHRIST. But every considerate reader must also know, that that may be a *firm*, which is at the same time a *vain* reliance. One man may lean with the same confidence on a *reed*, that another does on an oaken staff; still the difference between their respective situation is essential, the fall of the one being as certain as the position of the other is secure. The necessity, therefore, of guarding against deception in a matter on which the safety of the party depends, by preventing him from mistaking a reed that will break under him, for the staff that will support him, must be obvious. Such was the object our Reformers had before them, in their Homily on Faith; with the view of counteracting the error of those, who had taken advantage of some expressions that had been made use of on that subject.

“ On account of which mispersuasion (BURNET tells us) CRANMER employed Dr. REDMAYN, the most learned and judicious divine, to write a short treatise, for the purpose of laying down the nature of faith; in which he distinguishes between a persuasion of the truth of religion, which CRANMER elsewhere calls “*general faith*,” and such a belief as begets submission to the will of GOD. When, therefore, we are said to be *justified by faith*, we may not think that we are justified by faith, as it is a separate virtue from hope and charity, fear of GOD, and repentance; but it is meant faith, *neither only nor alone*, but with the aforesaid virtues coupled together, containing (as is aforesaid) the obedience to the whole doctrine and religion of CHRIST.”\*

So that according to our original Reformers, faith is to be considered both in a *general* and *particular* sense, as a professional and practical quality, the one available to salvation, the other not; the distinction between which they considered necessary to be kept in sight, as furnishing the standard by which the spiritual condition of the Christian professor was to be ascertained.

Such was the light in which this subject was meant to be placed in my Third Letter to Sir R. HILL, and had an incorrect use of terms tended to create any doubt relative to my meaning in particular passages; the following decided quotation taken from that Letter

\* BURNET's Hist. Ref. vol. i. p. 286.

was certainly well suited to remove it:—"So long as vain pretensions are liable to be set up by many who call themselves Christians, it is the duty of the watchmen of Israel to counteract them, by making such Christians understand the difference between *faith* and *faith*; between that faith which qualifies for admission into the Gospel covenant, and that faith by which Christians, in order to entitle them to the rewards of it, are expected to live, and by which their character is rendered complete. 'The just shall live by faith,' that is, such a faith as grows from step to step, till the whole righteousness of God be fulfilled in it. 'From faith to faith,' (faith the Apostle) which St. AUGUSTINE thus expounds—From faith *believing*, to faith *obeying*; from *imperfect* faith, to faith *made perfect* by the animation of charity; that he who *is justified* by his admission into the covenant of grace by baptism, may be *justified still* at the day of final retribution. For if we proceed from *faith* to *faith*, from *believing* to *obeying*, from faith in the *understanding* to faith in the *will*; from faith barely assenting to the revelations of God, to faith obeying the Commandments; from the body of faith to the soul of faith, that is, to faith formed and made alive by charity; then we shall proceed *from justification to justification*; *i. e.* from remission of sins in baptism, to become the sons of GOD; by which we become, first, partakers of the benefits of CHRIST's death, and at last to an actual

possession of those glories, to which we were con-  
signed, by the fruits of the Holy Ghost." \*

Should the foregoing luminous passage, taken from the writings of pious Bishop TAYLOR, not be proof against that confusion on this subject, which Mr. O.'s analysis of my pages has produced, I know no passage that will be deemed sufficiently decided for that purpose; and I see no possible advantage to be derived to the Christian cause from an exchange of clear, precise, and discriminate language, calculated to convey a plain meaning to the plainest understanding, for that loose, general, and undefined language, which Calvinists have introduced into this subject; and which, if intelligible at all, is, I believe, for the most part at least, intelligible only to themselves.

But how desirous soever I have been, after the example of our Reformers, to guard against deception on this important subject, still my endeavours, so far as Mr. O. is concerned, appear to have been altogether vain: For, in answer to what the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers say in the passage referred to by Mr. O., that, when speaking of faith as not necessarily productive of good works, I "spoke of faith only as an *abstract* proposition, *undistinguished by any characteristical epithet* to determine its peculiar quality,"—Mr. O. immediately subjoins, "the very contrary to this has been proved to be the fact." P. 280.

\* Appendix, p. 164.

A gross misrepresentation of the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers, by not suffering them to speak their own language, is then made introductory to the following argument:—"The argument, therefore, is, (says Mr. O.) because that which is *not* faith, is not necessarily productive, therefore that which *is* faith is not necessarily productive." This argument, however, built as it is on a false foundation, brought forward to give a sort of *coup de grace* to the supposed cause of the Reviewers and Mr. D., may, indeed, answer some purpose, by imposing on the cursory reader; but were either the Reviewers, or Mr. D., capable of using such an argument as Mr. O. has thought proper to put together for them, he need not have written a single page for their consideration, for in such case they had not been in a condition to be reasoned with. Mr. O. might, with equal propriety, have made them argue thus: because the moon does not bring to perfection the vegetative system of nature, *therefore* the sun does not. But this argument, intended to expose the false reasoning of the Reviewers and myself, will, upon analysis, be found built, not less on a notorious misconception of our Reformers, than it evidently is on the gross misrepresentation of those to whom it is ascribed.

The argument we have just had stated; but previously to its being admitted to be sound logic, and to bear on the case in hand, it was incumbent on

Mr. O. to have proved, that faith, taken in an *abstract* sense, (that sense in which it was argued upon by the parties under judgment) was *not faith*. For the whole of Mr. O.'s reasoning on this subject turns upon a QUIBBLE on the word *faith*, which he seems determined not to understand in that sense in which it was on this occasion meant to be understood; in spite of what the Reformers have expressly said on this subject; namely, that this faith in the *abstract*, (in their words) "this persuasion and belief in man's heart, whereby he agreeth unto all truth of God's most holy word, is *properly called faith*."—*Homily*, p. 21. It is admitted, that afterwards, on comparing this same *vain* faith with *true, lively, genuine* faith, by way of marking the important distinction between them, our Reformers say, that the former "*is not faith*:" not, surely, with the intent to contradict what they had before advanced on this head, but to convince their readers, by the strongest language, that this *professional* faith was not that *true, genuine, saving* faith, which it was the great object of their Homily to enforce. So that on this, as on a former occasion, Mr. O. appears to have carried away the *words* of our Reformers, but to have left their *local* meaning behind; and by thus separating language from its appropriate signification, Mr. O., whilst he may be said to be *verbally* right, is at the same time *essentially* wrong.

The argument here brought forward by Mr. O., if drawn according to truth, must therefore be differently stated. The Anti-Jacobin Reviewers maintain, in their observations on my Letter to Mrs. MORE, that faith, considered only as *an abstract proposition*, that is, mere professional faith, is not necessarily productive; therefore (according to the conclusion drawn for them and myself by Mr. O.) "*true lively faith is not necessarily productive.*" The reader will not fail to give the credit of this argument to its proper author; and Mrs. M., it is probable, will not consider herself to be fortunate in a defence of her novel position, relative to the naturally necessary connection between faith and works, which depends chiefly on the gross misrepresentation of the evidence that has been brought against it.

Having thus far cleared the ground, I proceed to the consideration of the position, which constitutes the basis of Mr. O.'s argument; namely, that "our Church considers good works the *natural* fruit and *necessary* effect of that faith which justifieth;" or, as Mrs. MORE expresses herself, that "the duties of Christianity grow out of the doctrines of it, as the *natural* and *necessary* productions of such a living root." No expression calculated to convey the idea of a *natural* and *necessary* connection subsisting between justifying faith and good works being to be found either in the Scripture, the writings of our Re-

formers, or the language of our Church, the position appears to be indefensible on either of those grounds. Such was my sentiment, when I addressed my Letter to Mrs. MORE ; and subsequent consideration has tended only to confirm it.

By a *natural* and *necessary* production must be understood a *physical* production, an effect produced by a certain cause in the regular and established course of nature. But faith is productive of works not *physically*, or by an impression of grace that is *irresistible*, but by a co-operation of grace with those means and instruments, by which the Holy Ghost worketh to the conversion, renovation, and sanctification of the sinner. Good works, then, as the fruit of lively faith, are not a *natural* but *moral* production, and though they may be said to be a *necessary* production, as essential to the perfection of a moral agent, still they will be produced only in proportion as moral motives, accompanied by Divine grace, exercise their proper influence on the mind of the party concerned. Regarding only the effect produced, as necessary to determine the perfection of the cause, both physical and moral obligation are to be seen in the same light. Still, it is presumed, no great degree of precision is necessary to discriminate between a certain cause, according to the regular course of nature, *necessarily* producing a certain effect, and the necessity that a certain cause should produce such an effect, in order to determine the



*perfection of its quality.* In the one case, we have a physical agent regularly and *necessarily* proceeding to the accomplishment of a pre-established system; in the other, a moral being, whose advancement towards perfection is regulated by his concurrence with the directing influence of Divine grace. In both cases, the effect produced is necessary to determine the perfection of the productive cause; at the same time that the manner in which the effect is produced widely differs. In the natural world, cause and effect have been so linked together in the settled order of things, as to be inseparable; one *necessarily* follows the other; in the moral world, though the perfection of the Divine system requires that the chain of connection between spiritual causes and their effects should also be so inseparable, that the one ought to be the necessary consequence of the other; still the preservation of this intended connection is left to depend, in some measure, on the disposition and exertion of the moral agent; And of this distinction between the two cases, the epithets appropriated to each case respectively ought, according to due precision of language, to be peculiarly descriptive. On the ground, then, of *incorrectness of language* it was, that the position advanced by Mrs. M., relative to the duties of Christianity growing out of the doctrines of it, as the *natural* and *necessary* production of such a living root, was objected to; as tending to confound the established

operation of nature with the ordinary dispensation of Divine grace, and thereby to lead to a conclusion unfriendly to the Christian cause.

The epithets *natural* and *necessary*, however appropriate, when applied to the established order of nature, appear to be out of place, when applied to a work carried on in opposition to nature; for nature and grace, in the great work of the *new creation*, are acting in a direction contrary to each other. By a rational and regenerate mind, the necessary connection between the doctrines and duties of Christianity will be readily admitted, and faith and works in consequence will, in a certain sense, be considered as inseparable. Independent of Christian motives, there can be no such thing as Christian practice; in this sense the doctrines and duties of Christianity are inseparable, because the end is not to be obtained but through the means. But though the motives which the Gospel furnishes, are the only motives which can effectually enforce Christian practice, still Christian practice will always be in proportion to the continued energy of its productive cause. The doctrine of our Church is, that "good works do necessarily spring out of a true and lively faith." Article 12. And the position, when properly understood, is incontrovertible; for so long as true *lively* faith exists, in other words, so long as the motives furnished by the Gospel produce, through Divine grace, their proper influence on the

party, such must be the consequence. Still, whilst there is a possibility of man's resisting and quenching the Holy Spirit, of doing despite (as the Apostle strongly expresses it) to the Spirit of grace, of neglecting to make a proper use of the means of salvation, and thereby falling away from God, what may be lively faith to-day, may not be equally so to-morrow; and consequently the connection between faith and works is not of that settled and invariable kind, to justify the use of epithets, which, in propriety of language, apply only to the uniform and established course of nature.

Mr. O., in p. 276, observes, that true believers, "on believing, become united to CHRIST, as the branches are to the vine, and through the continued exercise of faith derive from him strength and nourishment, and whatever is requisite for the support of the spiritual life." That the principle of the Christian life is derived from CHRIST, every Christian minister must readily admit; our only object in touching on this delicate subject has been to prevent that principle from being abused. The allusion to the work of nature, in the case of the vine and its branches, like numberless other allusions introduced by our Saviour, for the purpose of making the senses minister to the understanding on spiritual subjects, was intended to point out that spiritual connection between CHRIST and the Christian, on the actual existence of which the spiritual life and

consequent practice of the party depended. So far, then, we are perfectly agreed. But figurative allusions are to be taken in a figurative sense, and so far only as they were intended to apply to the case in hand; otherwise they change their nature, and become *literal descriptions*. This appears to be the case, when an allusion to the process of nature is made *literally* applicable to the process of grace.

Mr. O. says, "the Church concludes, that, *in the nature of things*, it is impossible it should be otherwise, that the principles of the Gospel, really embraced, must be operative." P. 276. I know not where the Church has *thus* concluded. I know not where she points out the work of nature, as an exemplar by which the Christian is to form an *accurate* idea relative to the work of grace. The two works admit of a comparison only to a certain extent; beyond that, the language employed on the occasion becomes incorrect, and leads to error. Our Reformers meant to say, that *true lively* Christian faith will be operative. Our Church in her Twelfth Article says, it *must* be operative; for whilst the exercise of *true lively* faith continues, its effects must be produced. But so long as the branch remains on the vine, by the regular process of nature, it derives a continued communication of sap from the stock. Whereas, in the case of the Christian, when true lively faith ceases to act, the spiritual communication between CHRIST and his member is for the time

suspended, and the work of grace receives, in consequence, at least a temporary interruption. Should this interruption continue till the long-suffering of God be exhausted, the fruitless branch will be entirely taken away.

Such appears to be the fair reasoning deducible from the allusion employed by our Saviour on this occasion, which seems calculated to secure both the principle as well as practice of Christianity, and thereby to render the man of God perfect, by teaching us that as "the branch cannot bear fruit itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can we, except we abide in CHRIST, because without CHRIST we can do nothing;" and at the same time, that "every branch in CHRIST (every member in his Church) that beareth not fruit, shall be taken away." Whereas to describe "good works as the *natural* fruit and *necessary* effect of that faith which justifieth," is to lead to the conclusion, that the dispensations of grace and of nature have been equally settled according to a previous established system, so as to render the progress of cause and effect in both equally uniform and invariable. But however this *literal* application of a figurative allusion to the necessary connection between faith and works may correspond with the Calvinistic notion of *finished* salvation in the case of individuals, according to which both the end and the means have been definitively provided, in conformity with the absolute predetermined

will of the DEITY; still it does not at all accord with the condition of fallen man, under the covenant of grace, as a moral and accountable agent. We can not therefore be surpris'd, that the language of Scripture, together with the too-frequently interrupted progress of man's salvation, should bear the most decided testimony against it.

What, it may be asked, became of the *natural* and *necessary* connection between faith and good works in the case of St. PETER? who, though undoubtedly possessed of justifying faith, when he was pronounced *blest* by our Saviour, on the declaration of his creed, yet afterwards basely forsook and denied his Master. Nor could St. PAUL entertain any idea of this *natural* and *necessary* connection between faith and works, when in his own case he expressed a fear, lest, chosen vessel as he was, after all his preaching to others, "he himself should be a cast-away;" or when he directed those, who thought they stood firm in the faith, to take heed lest they fall; or when he intimated the possibility of *their* falling away, who had actually "been enlightened, had tasted of the heavenly gift, and been made partakers of the Holy Ghost," Heb. vi. 4. In conformity with the general tenor of Scripture on this subject was the sentiment of our Reformers, who declared, in the case of the penitent thief, that the justification obtained by his confession on the

cross would have been again lost, "had he lived, and not regarded faith and the works thereof."

From whence it appears that *lively* faith, though an active quality, possesses not that *natural self-energetic* principle, which will necessarily cause it to continue in action, independent of the accompanying influence of Divine grace. For when, in consequence of any defect in the party, that grace is withheld, human infirmity prevails, and the man falls. Faith, then, is that quality of the mind which may either totally fail, remain in an inactive state, or be carried on to perfection, in proportion as the means of grace, upon which its advancement depends, are diligently and properly made use of.

Such appears to have been the doctrine inculcated by St. PETER on this subject, when he directs "the elect according to the fore-knowledge of GOD," and who, he says, had "obtained like precious promises with himself," 2 Pet. i. 1, to "give diligence to make their calling and election *sure*," by adding to their faith all Christian graces and virtues; instructing them, that if these things were in them, and abounding, they should "neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, and that if they did these things they should never fall."

With the same notion of the progressive growth of faith, through the accompanying influence of Divine grace, and the proper exertion of the party,

St. PAUL thus writes to his disciples at Thessalonica:

“We are bound to thank God always for you, brethren, as it is meet, because that your faith groweth exceedingly. Wherefore we also pray always for you, that God would count you worthy of this calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness, and *the work of faith with power*, that the name of our Lord JESUS CHRIST may be glorified in you, and ye in him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord JESUS CHRIST.”

2. Theff. i. 11, 12.

To multiply proofs in a point so generally established, would be to trespass on my reader; I will therefore add only the words of an exemplary prelate of the present day, which appear to deliver the plain doctrine of Scripture on this important subject:—“Yet however firmly we may believe all the great essential doctrines of the Gospel, this alone will not ensure our salvation, unless *to our faith we add obedience* to all the laws of CHRIST. This we are expressly told in the concluding verse of this chapter. After our Lord had prescribed to his disciples the form of words to be used in baptism, he adds, ‘teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you.’ By making this the conclusion, the winding-up, as it were, of his Gospel, he meant to express, in the strongest manner, the indispensable necessity of a holy life resulting from a vital faith. The belief of the Christian revelation, if ge-



nuae and sincere, will, [not as Mr. O. says, "*in the nature of things,*" but] *with the blessing of God in our own strenuous exertions*, produce all those Christian graces and virtues, which through the merits of our Redeemer, will render our final calling and election sure."\*

Upon the indispensable necessity of a holy life, resulting from a vital faith, there can be but one opinion among rational Christians. The only difference appears to respect the manner in which this important work is carried on. From the uniform tenor of Scripture we learn, that good works, as the fruit of faith, depend for their production upon the joint operation of Divine grace and human exertion; and that the end in this case will, generally speaking, be in proportion to the proper use of the means. With this uniform tenor of Scripture the language of our Church strictly corresponds, considering Divine grace as the preventing, leading, and directing principle of the spiritual life; and on that account pressing on her members the faithful use of those means, together with a diligent attention to the great work of salvation, which may secure to them the continuance of its effectual aid; and therefore she teaches them to pray, "that the grace of God may always prevent and follow them, and make them continually to be given to all good works; that they may so faithfully serve God in this life,

\* Bp. PORTEUS' Lectures, Lect. 24.

that they fail not finally to attain the heavenly promises.”\* Doctrine both sound and rational; but which appears to be totally incompatible with the idea conveyed by the language, which has been newly introduced into this subject, relative to that *natural* and *necessary* connection supposed to have been established between faith and works; which places man more in the light of a machine, to be worked upon according to some certain pre-established system of cause and effect, than in that of a moral agent, who is to be accountable for his own work. “The Gospel is addressed to man as a moral and accountable being. He is called on to work out his salvation, because GOD worketh in him both to will and to do. In what manner and to what degree Divine grace and human endeavour co-operate in the great work of salvation, the Scripture has no where precisely informed him. What man, therefore, does not know, it would be folly in him to attempt to explain. At the same time it must be remembered, that whatever doctrine tends in any way to militate against a position so clearly revealed, cannot be a genuine doctrine of Scripture.”† On this ground I objected to the position laid down by Mrs. MORE; and I must confess, that nothing that I have yet seen advanced in its defence, has in the least changed my opinion on the subject. At the

\* Collect for 13th Sunday after Trinity.

† Letter to Mrs. H. MORE, p. 50.

same time it must be remembered, that my objection applied rather to incorrectness of expression than unsoundness of intention; because the language objected to was remarked to be incompatible with the general doctrine, which it appeared to be Mrs. MORE's professed object to inculcate, and on which she had, in some other pages of her publication, expressed herself with marked decision. The expression, therefore, considered to have been inadvertently adopted, was candidly submitted to re-consideration; with the view of guarding against that conclusion, to which, in the judgment of some readers, it might be made to minister.

Mr. O. says, "That the particular doctrine in question is neither new nor dangerous, has been fully approved above." This, however, is but assertion. Of the proof my reader will judge; at the same time remembering, that the Bible is the true standard of divinity; and by the Bible no such doctrine is to be established. And when it is considered, that to a want of due precision in language, many errors in divinity are to be traced, and to what unsound conclusion the position in question may be made to lead; it will probably be thought, that the objection against the incorrectness of Mrs. MORE's expression on this subject has something in it more than mere verbal criticism, to entitle it to attention.

But "such (says Mr. O.) is the undeniable and extraordinary worth of Mrs. MORE's performance,

that it has extorted the approbation, or rather excited the astonishment, of nearly all persons, of all sentiments and persuasions, in whom there is a capability of approving real excellence." P. 318. To approve real excellence is one thing; to subscribe to the infallibility of a writer, however excellent, is another. Had I been incapable of the former, in the case of Mrs. MORE, (as Mr. O. would insinuate) I should have disgraced myself. Were I in compliment to Mrs. M. to do the latter, it would be a compliment, which the good sense of that lady would reject. At the same time being sensible that it is oftentimes not the thing itself, so much as the manner of doing it, that gives offence; it was my object to accompany my remarks on Mrs. MORE's writings with the respect due to the distinguished character of the writer, together with that full acknowledgment of her abilities, and of the honourable and successful manner in which they have often been employed, which must be made by every candid man. My language was not, perhaps, that language of hyperbole, to which the ears of Mrs. M. may have been familiarized, but it was something better—it was the language of an honest man; of a man who, whilst he honoured the lady for her zeal in the cause of religion, of morality, and of her country, considered himself as acting strictly within the line of his profession, when animadverting on what appeared to him to be an erroneous interpretation of St. PAUL.

If there has been any misunderstanding of the Lady's meaning on my part, as is intimated in the Preface\* to the compleat edition of her works, such a circumstance afforded an opportunity for preventing the possibility of future mistake. But the passage in question is suffered to remain, unaccompanied with explanation or comment; whence we are led to

\* "For fair criticism (says Mrs. MORE, in p. 24 of her Preface) I have been ever truly thankful. For candid correction, from whatever quarter it came, I have always exhibited the most unquestionable proof of my regard, by adopting it. Nor can I call to mind any instance of improvement, which has been suggested to me, by which I have neglected to profit."—To which is subjoined, in a note, "If it be objected, that this has not been the case with respect to one single passage, which has excited some controversy, it has arisen not from any want of openness to conviction in me, but from my conceiving myself to have been misunderstood, and for that reason only misrepresented." In the page of Mrs. MORE's work the objectionable passage remains, with the following note subjoined to it:—"This is the language of our Church, as may be seen in her Twelfth Article. Good works do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit." Now though I may unintentionally have misunderstood what Mrs. MORE said relative to the Eleventh and Twelfth Chapters to the Romans; still I could not misunderstand the language to which my criticism was principally directed, as contained in that passage, in which Mrs. M. said, that the "duties grew out of the doctrines of Christianity, as the *natural* and *necessary* productions of such a living root." Mrs. MORE now maintains this to be the language of our Church on the ground of the Twelfth Article. Whereas to me Mrs. MORE appears to have strained the figurative allusion in the Article beyond its intended meaning; and thereby to have furnished an opening for an erroneous conclusion. Whether the Twelfth Article will bear Mrs. MORE out in the language objected to, and how far my criticism upon it is entitled to the epithets *fair* and *candid*, are points freely submitted to the judgment of the reader.

apprehend that the erroneous conclusion, to which it was deemed capable of ministering, is of a kind, that Mrs. M. does not think it necessary or expedient to counteract.

The advocates who have expressly stepped forward in Mrs. M.'s defence, are passed by in silence. The language they have addressed to me, has, generally speaking, been such, as to be entitled to no answer; and as controversy *thus* carried on is what I most dislike, I do not wish to furnish the gentlemen concerned with a provocation to enter again into a field, in which they appear to so little advantage. The object Mr. O. appears to have had before him, (although his language is not quite so coarse, perhaps, as that of the nameless writers above alluded to) corresponds in the main with what theirs was; the obvious design of his publication being to place my writings in a light, in which they might do the least possible credit to their author. But on this head I refrain from enlargement. Mr. O.'s publication, and my writings are before the world; every intelligent reader, if disposed, has it in his power to appreciate them; and the more the reader is left to himself for that purpose, sufficient documents being laid before him, the more correct, probably, will his judgment be. It not being my wish to preclude that judgment, I content myself, on this occasion, with furnishing the means necessary to qualify it for its important office.

*Recapitulatory Conclusion.*

**H**AVING paid attention to the distinguishing features of Mr. OVERTON'S publication, I draw to a conclusion; not without feeling a pleasure in the prospect of being discharged from a work, which has only furnished additional reason for lamenting the causeless divisions subsisting in a Church, whose members ought to be known by the Christian characteristics of unity and concord.

† The subjects handled in the foregoing Chapters, were they designed for masters in Israel, might, if even necessary to be handled at all, most certainly have been brought into a much narrower compass. But as I write only for those, who may yet have a profession to study, the length to which I have been carried on some points, will, I trust, find its apology in the consideration, that the detection of a fallacy can never be confined within the same limits as its assertion, nor a vindication be made out in a form equally compendious with that of the charge.

The ostensible object of Mr. O.'s book is to apologize for those regular Clergy of the Establish-

ment, (as he calls them) who maintain that interpretation of our Articles, which is distinguished by the title *Calvinistic*. Whilst from the execution of his undertaking, which furnishes the most decided contradiction to the candid professions of his Preface, his real object appears to have been, the pronouncing, as it were, of an *ex-cathedra* sentence on the *great* body of the established Clergy; who, because they do not see this subject in the same light as he does, are represented as having departed from that sense, in which it was the original design of our Church that her doctrines should be professed. My writings having constituted one principal medium, through which the professional character of my brethren, no less than myself, has been traduced, to them my attention has been chiefly confined; and it is to be expected, that after a thirty years study of my profession, I should not be unprepared to defend it. In what manner that defence has been conducted, my reader has seen. He has also seen, by what kind of proof Mr. O.'s charge of heterodoxy has been made out. From the analysis of Mr. O.'s reasoning and evidence, laid before him in the preceding Chapters, he must have seen too, that my sentiments undergo, for the most part, such a metamorphose in Mr. O.'s edition of them, as no longer to be cognizable for my own. What by the means of misapplication and mutilation; by the expedient of words put in, and words left out; by the help of



sentences divorced from their legitimate context, aided by indirect insinuations, and in some instances unequivocal assertions, relative to the principles of his supposed opponents; Mr. O. has contrived to make me speak, just what the proof which he had to establish required that I should speak.\* Indeed so gross have been the misrepresentations of my text, so notorious the “*iniquity of quotation*” practised in some instances by Mr. O., that I have been constrained from a respect to the profession, to conclude, that Mr. O. has written on this occasion (as it has been reported) from documents furnished from various quarters, hastily collected with more zeal than judgment, and adopted without proper examination.

But the misrepresentation of my writings, gross as it unquestionably is, is a matter of little moment, compared with that misrepresentation of the *genuine doctrines* of our Church, which distinguishes some parts of Mr. O’s publication. So long as the *essential* doctrines of Christianity are unequivocally maintained, and individuals are left to their own private opinions on those points, which, because not clearly revealed, have therefore not been particularly defined; the end for which the Church has been established may be effectually answered, without the peace of it

\* Notorious specimens to justify the above charge are to be found in pages 115, 199, 211, 215, 265, 279, of Mr. O.’s publication: and I know not that I should err widely from truth, were I to adopt Mr. O’s frequent method of concluding his references, by adding the comprehensive word *passim* on this occasion.

being disturbed by a controversy, which must always prove fruitless, whilst the parties disagree with respect to the authority by which it is to be settled. But when Calvinism, by a strange perversion of judgment, becomes the established standard of Orthodoxy; when it is delivered from the pulpit, and sent forth from the press, cloathed in the unequivocal language of confident assertion, and is made the touchstone by which true churchmanship is to be ascertained; when nothing is admitted to be Gospel preaching, which does not accord with the peculiar phraseology of men, who assume to themselves the exclusive title of *Evangelical Ministers*;—in such case, that is taken for granted, which ought to have been proved; and those of the Clergy, against whom the unqualified charge, relative to the unfaithful execution of their commission, has been brought, are called upon to defend that scriptural ground, on which, as true pastors of the Church of England, it is incumbent on them to make their stand.

This, then, is a subject of some moment; more so, perhaps, than at first sight it may appear. But when we observe the eager solicitude now manifested among persons of a Calvinistic turn, to give their peculiar tenets a marked ascendancy in the public mind, by industriously inculcating the persuasion, that Calvinism is the *only true* religion, and *that* intended to be established by our Church; and at the same time we turn our eyes back to those disastrous events, which

once accompanied the overbearing influence of these unscriptural tenets in this country ; the subject appears to challenge the most *serious* consideration.

Either, then, the doctrine of the Church of England is *Calvinistic*, or it is *not*. To be *Calvinistic*, it must so far conform to the religious creed of J. CALVIN, as to justify its title to that distinctive epithet. Should this *not* be the case, a point which to me appears capable of demonstration, the epithet, as calculated to lead into error, ought to be discarded. From whence it follows, that those who so confidently preach Calvinism, are not the *true Churchmen* they consider themselves to be ; nor by their unceasing attempts to render the Clergy of the Establishment odious, and by misrepresenting their doctrines, to draw from their ministry those whom the Constitution has committed to their charge, do they prove themselves those sound friends to their country, which the religion of CHRIST requires that they should be.

Mr. O.'s publication appears designed to bring this cause, which has been so repeatedly heard, to a new trial. But that it may be fairly tried, appeal must be made, not so much to the private sentiments of individuals, as to those public documents, by which the judgment of the Church is to be ascertained. For it by no means follows, that because some individuals have written incorrectly, or committed themselves unadvisedly on certain subjects, therefore

a contrary doctrine maintained by their opponents must be true. Admitting, therefore, that Mr. O. had proved every thing that he has attempted against individuals, his proof at best concerned only those individuals, and could contribute nothing to the point in question; namely, the establishment of the Calvinistic doctrine as the doctrine of the Church of England. After all, truth perhaps may lie between them; and at all events that party will be most likely to find it, who, in the search, is most capable of abstracting his mind from personal considerations and previous possessions:

The indictment preferred by Mr. O. consists of the following several counts.—That the Clergy, against whom it is brought, are guilty of extenuating and evading the plain, literal, and grammatical sense of the Articles; and of not adhering to the true and primitive doctrines of these forms. P. 392. That they do not insist on the necessity of personal and practical Christianity, p. 393; considering all persons *real* Christians who are educated in Christian countries, except professed infidels and notorious offenders against the good order of society, p. 396; indeed, that all who have been baptized into the Church, and thereby become “her nominal members, will be saved, *whatever be their characters.*” P. 102. That in the important doctrines of human depravity, repentance, justification, and good works, their sentiments are evasive and unscriptural.

P. 393. That their notions of loyalty, residence, veracity, candour, and charity, are unsound; and their apologies for the stage, and other scenes of dissipation, inconsistent with that strictness and seriousness which the Church inculcates: P. 396. That they “vindicate and plead for the *violation of the laws of the land, the laws of the Church, the express condition on which they are instituted to their benefices, the admonitions of their ordinary, their own solemn oath, and every motive that can bind the conscience, or influence the conduct, of an honest man.*”

P. 255. In a word, (and a *strong* word it is) that “they object to the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in the Redeemer, under whatever form or name it is professed;” p. 97; and by not sufficiently distinguishing between real and merely nominal Christians, by not insisting on holy life as essential to a state of salvation, &c., they teach men “to think well of their state and character, and to hope for admission into Heaven, who are not only destitute of the required dispositions of heart, but guilty of many gross immoralities; yea, who live in open violation of every one of the Ten Commandments, except those, the known breach of which would banish them out of the country, or make work for the executioner.” P. 299.

In conformity with the privilege generally assumed by Calvinists, after the example of the founder of their sect, to address coarse language to their opponents, *thus* writes Mr. OVERTON.

And *thus* writes the pious and charitable Bishop HALL:—"This is the stale and known machination of him whose true title is, *the accuser of the brethren*. That old dragon, when he saw the woman flying to the wilderness to avoid his rage, what doth he? He casts out of his mouth water as a flood, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood. What are these waters which he casts out of his mouth, but slanderous accusations, lyings, detractions, cruel persecutions of the tongue? And shall we, that profess the dear name of one common Saviour, so far second the great enemy of mankind, as to derive some cursed channels from those hellish floods of his, for the drenching of the flourishing valley of God's Church? Shall we rather imitate him than the blessed Archangel of God, who contending with the devil, and disputing about the body of MOSES, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, '*The Lord rebuke thee.*' Nay, shall we dare to do that to brethren, which the angel durst not do to the devil."\*

He who is accustomed to form the lowest opinion of others, is seldom found defective in the appreciation of himself. The reader will not, therefore, be surprised to find Mr. O.'s unqualified charge against his brethren concluded, with the following decided declaration in favour of himself and his clients:—"We then (says he) are the *true Churchmen*; and

\* HALL, vol. iii. p. 51.

whatever astonishment certain critics may express at the affirmation, in a very fundamental and important sense of the word, Mr. D. and his associates are Dissenters from the Church of England; these critics themselves being judges, &c." P. 397. The critics here referred to may probably smile; but after what they have already seen of Mr. O.'s manner of writing, they can hardly be astonished at any affirmation which he may think fit to make. At the same time it may be observed *en passant*, that the language of the Reviewers, if taken in their *own sense* on the occasion, (and to take it in *any other* does not conflict with that "interpretation of it, which plain honest men of sound understandings would make," and for which Mr. O. pleads in his Preface, p. 8) if it applies at all to the declaration to which it is here subjoined, will be more against Mr. O. than for him.

Meeting Mr. O., however, on the ground on which he has placed himself, as the apologist for those ministers, whom *he* distinguishes by the title of "*true Churchmen*," it may be necessary in the conclusion to bring into review the method that has been adopted for the establishment of such distinction.

To prove that the sentiments of our original Reformers were *Calvinistic*, Mr. O. brings forward the testimony of different historians, speaking in some degree to the fact.\* But this was to take his

\* Mr. O., in his usual stile of unqualified assertion, informed his readers, (p. 92) that "historians, ancient and modern, all *with one*

readers for the most part on their weak side, the generality of them not having qualified themselves to judge of the degree of credit, to which these historians may be entitled. Many of them, there is too much reason to think, never made themselves sufficiently acquainted with the *ecclesiastical* history of *this* country, to entitle them to any credit at all on *this* head. STRYPE and BURNET, alone of the number appear to have made it a particular object of attention, and their testimony is far from being favourable to Mr. O.'s hypothesis. What MOSHEIM says, "that after the death of HENRY, the universities, the schools, and the Churches, became the oracles of Calvinism; and that when it was proposed, in EDWARD the VIth's reign, to give a fixed and stable turn to the doctrine and discipline of the Church, Geneva was acknowledged as a sister Church, and the theological system there established by Calvin was adopted, and rendered the public rule of faith in England;" p. 70; admitting it to be true, is certainly very decided testimony: but if its truth be examined into, it proves nothing so much as the historian's inadequate acquaintance with the ecclesiastical state of *this* country at that period.

The public Liturgy introduced in King EDWARD's reign was drawn up by a committee of bishops and

*coice*, have told us, that our public confessions are formed upon the Augustinian or Calvinian plan." Mr. O. should have excepted the principal ecclesiastical historians of *this country* out of the number, for they certainly tell us no such thing, but rather assert the *contrary*.



divines appointed by the King for that purpose; who in their performance “resolved to govern themselves by the word of God, and the precedent of the Primitive Church. To this purpose it was very prudently agreed to make use of *none but English help.*”<sup>\*</sup> So far from its being the design of the compilers, that the theological system of Geneva should be established by it, the offer of CALVIN’s assistance was (the historian† expressly informs us) happily refused by CRANMER; and the English Liturgy HEYLIN has proved to have been finished, before MARTIN BUCER and [PETER MARTYR arrived in this country. The objections afterward made to several parts of the Liturgy in CALVIN’s letter to the Lord Protector, prove that it had not been put together in conformity with his system. Indeed CALVIN was himself sensible of the insufficiency of his authority with the Bishops of England at this time, and therefore pushed his design of improving upon the Reformation in which they were engaged by his agents in the court, the country, and the universities.‡ But though the Liturgy underwent a review soon after its original compilation, ‘still the Act of Parliament, in the 13th of January 1552, which finally established it, speaks of the former Service-book’ in the following honourable manner:—That it was “a very godly order, agreeable to the word of God and the Primitive

<sup>\*</sup> COLLIER, p. 253.    † COLLIER.    ‡ HEYLIN Hist. p. 107.

Church," and that the review of it had been occasioned by "divers doubts having arisen for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the ministers and mistakers, than of *any worthy cause*."\* Dr. BANCROFT, afterwards Archbishop of CANTERBURY, affirmed that the first Liturgy in King EDWARD's reign was compiled and confirmed by a synod; but soon after, to use Fox's words, "through the obstinate and dissembling malice of many, objections were raised against it." These unnecessary cavils brought on a review of it. Thus the second book was published. And when Dr. GRINDAL wrote from Frankfort to RIDLEY, then in prison, and acquainted him with KNOX's opposition to the English service, on which account appeal was made to CALVIN, the Bishop lamented KNOX's litigious temper, and justified the Liturgy. BANCROFT's sermon at PAUL's cross. Feb. 1588. From whence the conclusion is, that the objections made to the original Liturgy did not respect the essentials of it, but those explanations, which the mistaken judgment of some obstinate people had rendered necessary. It stands, moreover, on record, that CALVIN, long after the review of our Liturgy, felt a disappointment at his opinion not being more attended to than it actually was, in the establishment of our theological system; for so late as the year 1555, when appeal was made to him by

\* COLLIER, p. 320.

the English, who had fled from MARY's persecution to Frankfort, relative to the use of EDWARD's Liturgy, in his answer above laid before my reader, he expresses his disapprobation of it with great freedom. Indeed, with respect to the Universities, Schools, and Churches, becoming the oracles of Calvinism after the death of HENRY, we confidently affirm, from authority\* more competent than MOSHEIM's on this subject, that such was so far from being the fact, that it was not till the *latter end of Queen ELIZABETH's reign*, that the Calvinistic principles had gained that prevalence, which can in any degree correspond with the foregoing statement. Thus much for the authority of MOSHEIM on this subject. From whence it may be seen, how inadequate the testimony of historians may be to a determination of the point under consideration.

Mr. O. proceeds, in a similar way, to prove the attachment of our Reformers to the works of St. AUSTIN. To establish this point in the mind of his reader, the names of Bishop CARLETON and Dr. WARD, who assisted at the synod of DORT, are brought forward, together with those of Bishop BURNET, and TINDAL the historian. But having examined this subject with attention, and with no other object before me than truth, I hesitate not to say, that more has been taken for granted on this head, than ever has been, or is ever capable of being,

\* STRYPE.

proved. The answer given by LATIMER to the questions put to him by the divines appointed to dispute with him at Oxford, previously to his martyrdom, may be considered as speaking the language of his colleagues. "Then you are not (said the examining divines) of St. CHRYSOSTOM's faith, nor of St. AUSTIN's?—I have told you already, replied honest LATIMER, I am not, except when they bring Scripture for what they say." It would be moreover easy to shew, that St. AUSTIN, in much of his writing, is sufficiently Anti-Calvinistic, to be respected and quoted by those who reject all J. CALVIN's peculiarities. And St. AUSTIN himself, after he had, at the latter end of his life, appeared to favour these opinions, desired he might not be understood as at variance with himself, but merely as combating two opposite heresies, at two different periods. In consequence of which, though he might appear to hold contradictory opinions, still, considering truth to lie in the mean, his continued object was to throw his weight into that scale, which was kicking the beam. By bringing forward, however, the authority of St. AUSTIN, as that to which our Reformers so frequently resorted, the idea meant to be conveyed by Mr. O. was, that the particular doctrine introduced by him into the Church, relative to the Divine decrees, afterwards called *Calvinistic*, was the doctrine they had adopted. But to justify such conclusion, evidence should have

been brought to prove, that in their appreciation of AUSTIN's authority reference was had to the doctrine, by which his system of divinity was *peculiarly* distinguished; otherwise Mr. O. proved nothing to his present purpose. Admitting what Mr. O. says, that "next to the sacred Scriptures, our Reformers especially professed to respect the Primitive Church, and the works of St. AUSTIN;" there is still a wide difference between respecting the works of an author, and placing an entire faith in him. CALVIN's works have been respected and quoted by many divines, who reprobated his peculiar tenets. But why should the works of St. AUSTIN be *particularly* mentioned? In the Homilies St. AUSTIN is quoted in common with St. CHRYSOSTOM, and several other Fathers, whose opinion, on the subject under consideration, differed widely from that of St. AUSTIN: And if any conclusion on this head may be drawn from the language of our Reformers, the authority of St. CHRYSOSTOM appears to have had weight in their scale *at least equal* to that of St. AUSTIN; whilst the peculiar tenets, relative to the Divine decrees, were never heard of for the four first centuries of the Church, and when originally broached by St. AUSTIN, were held to be erroneous. The respect our Reformers confessedly had for the Primitive Church, furnishes, consequently, so strong a presumption against their departure from its authority, in favour of AUSTIN's *novel* doctrines, that nothing short of

decisive evidence ought to be deemed sufficient to substantiate the circumstance.

Bishop BURNET, indeed, says, that the Seventeenth Article "*seems* to be framed according to St. AUSTIN's doctrine." This, however, is but *seeming* evidence at best, which may have weight with readers pre-disposed for its reception, but to the discriminating mind it *proves* nothing; and as the Bishop, after the most circumstantial examination, did not himself receive this Article in a Calvinistic sense, it has been generally thought that he conceded too much on this subject. The divines who lived with BURNET, scrupled not, as my reader has above seen, to express themselves much more strongly on this point. When, indeed, the doctrines of CALVIN, towards the end of ELIZABETH's reign, had gained considerable prevalence in the Church of England, it was natural for those who had embraced them to seek to support them by the most respectable authority: in failure of evidence sufficient to their purpose, from the writings of our Reformers, and the established documents of our Church, their general appeal was to the writings of St. AUSTIN; a practice which tended in a great measure to establish the opinion, that those writings constituted the ground-work of our public forms.

Thus HUTTON, archbishop of York, in the year 1595, having adopted the Calvinistic tenets, wrote a treatise on that subject, and sent it to WARR-

gift, who was also somewhat inclined toward Calvinism, desiring that some person might be employed on the subject, who was well read in the writings of Austin.\* This was a way to make divines for the peculiar tenets of AUSTIN in the established forms of our Church, whether they were meant to be there or not ; but certainly not the best way of ascertaining the real sentiments of their compilers.

Thus, on another occasion, Dr. WHITACRE, in his complaint against BARRETT, expresses himself thus :—" For the points of doctrine we are fully persuaded, that Mr. BARRETT hath taught untruth, if *not against the Articles*, yet against the religion of our Church publicly received, &c." From whence it appears, that, according to the opinion then prevalent in the University, a divine might not teach *against the Articles*, and yet teach against the religion of a Church, for which those Articles were designed to be the established standard. For, proceeds Dr. WHITACRE, " although these points were not concluded and defined by public authority, yet forasmuch as they have been hitherto evermore held in our Church, therefore ought they not to be controverted."† From which concession § of so

\* STRYPE'S Life of WHITGIFT, p. 477.

† Ibid. Appendix, No. 25.

§ Such was the opinion which that very learned Calvinist, Dr. WHITACRE, formed on the subject of our Articles. Whereas a modern Calvinist, under the title of Presbyter, tells us, " that the

learned and zealous a professor of Calvinism, the obvious inference is, that no conclusion or definition relative to the Calvinistic doctrine having been made *by public authority*, the Calvinistic doctrine was a doctrine which the growth of Calvinism had by degrees grafted on the original text of our Articles, but which confessedly was not established by them.

In fact, the Calvinistic doctrine of our Church, in conformity with the supposed Calvinistic sentiments of our Reformers, is only to be proved, if proved at all, by a fair reference to the writings of our Reformers themselves, in conjunction with those public documents or circumstances, by which alone the judgment of our Church can be ascertained. Of these two kinds of proof, as my reader has seen, Mr. O. has been very sparing; and in bringing them forward, his attention, like that of most Calvinists who have gone over the same ground before him, has, for evident reasons, been directed more to the period subsequent to the re-establishment of the Reformation under ELIZABETH, than to the period that preceded it. The writings of CRANMER, RIDLEY, and LATIMER, for instance, which furnish such decisive evidence against the supposed Calvinistic sentiments of their respective authors, are passed over by Mr. O. in total silence. From HOOPER,

opinion of those divines, by whom our Articles were compiled, were uniformly, clearly, and *definitively* Calvinistic; and that the Articles are only capable of a Calvinistic sense." "Eo disconvenit,"



alone, of all our *original* Reformers, one extract is produced by him, for the purpose, it should seem, of making it speak that Calvinistic sense, relative to absolute decrees, against which the plain meaning of the Bishop's language was evidently designed to guard.\*

In bringing forward those documents and circumstances, by which alone the judgment of our Church can stand committed, Mr. O. has not been much more liberal. On the subject of the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy, Mr. O. says, what will be readily admitted, that "they uniformly breathe the same spirit, and express themselves with the same degree of force." P. 45. At the same time he has prudently avoided to compare these distinct species of writing with each other, for the purpose of ascertaining the kind of spirit they uniformly breathe. Had such a comparison in any degree promised to substantiate Mr. O.'s point, it had not failed to appear in his page to the best advantage,

Of the Royal Declaration prefixed to our Articles, next mentioned by Mr. O., we have already given our opinion; and as there will be occasion to introduce it again, we pass on to the next docu-

\* "The Gospellers (says BURNET) made strange inferences from the doctrine of Predestination, which had only been held *generally* by the Reformers, by making the decrees of God *absolute* and *unconditional*. Against this MELANCTHON expressly wrote. CALVIN maintained the decrees in their *absolute* sense. HOOPER, and other good writers, did often dehort from entering into these curiosities, and a *caveat* was afterward put into the Seventeenth Article to the same purpose."—BURNET'S Hist. Ref. vol. ii. p. 113.

ment, the celebrated Catechism of Dr. NOWELL. This, the reader is told, was enjoined to be studied by ministers, in order "that they might learn true divinity from it." P. 61. But by *true* divinity, according to Mr. O., is meant *Calvinistical* divinity. For, alluding to Bishop CLEAVER's edition of it, Mr. O. says, p. 76, "how a *confessedly Calvinistic* Catechism, circumstanced even as his Lordship represents this to have been, can afford an argument against the Calvinistic intention and interpretation of our Articles, some persons will not be easily convinced. How a Catechism, which, according to STRYPE, was reviewed, allowed, and passed by both Houses of the same Convocation, which reviewed and passed our present Articles, can be supposed to contain any other doctrine than that intended in these Articles, such persons do not conceive." And when Mr. O. shall have *proved*, what he here *assumes*, that this Catechism is *confessedly Calvinistic*, we will acknowledge that it goes some way to shew, that it was *so* intended by the Convocation to be understood. But before he adduced this document, Mr. O. would have done well to consider, that, if his assumption be contrary to truth, the argument justly built on the historic fact of its being "reviewed, allowed, and passed by both Houses of the same Convocation, which reviewed and passed our present Articles," makes *directly against* the position he labours to establish. And in this very point of

view we find the learned editor of this celebrated Catechism considers it, as "furnishing no small light towards the explanation of the Thirty-Nine Articles of faith and religion;" and in his admirable Preface declaring, in language as express as words can make it, that "from this Catechism it may be *clearly proved*, that our English Convocation did not mean to establish the Calvinistic interpretations of the Scriptures, whatever some men, and those of great name, might think of them at that time,"\*

The next document, which, from its notoriety, may be admitted to be a public one, is the Apology for the English Church by Bishop JEWELL. This document certainly contains an able and explicit defence of the *evangelical* doctrines established in our Church against the gross errors of the Church of Rome, but certainly does not represent them to be *Calvinistical*. Though the names of some foreign Reformers, as LUTHER and ZUINGLE, are introduced into it, yet the name of CALVIN does not once occur throughout the whole performance. And so far is the document from favouring the cause of Calvinism, that *universal* redemption, the doctrine in direct contradiction to the fundamental tenet of the Calvinistic Creed, is expressly and unequivocally

\* "Porro non parum lucis in explicandis 39 Fidei & Religionis Articulis præbiturus est hic Catechismus; quum ex hoc planè constare possit Convocationem Anglicanam nolle Calvinianas Scripturarum interpretationes, quicquid de iis tunc temporis senserint non pauci, iidemque magni nominis viri, lege sancire." *Prefat. ad Catech.*

maintained in it. To the particular point, therefore, which Mr. O. has undertaken to establish, this document does not appear to furnish the least assistance.

The analysis of the Thirty-nine Articles by ROGERS, p. 63, cannot be admitted to be a *public* document, by which the Church stands committed; whilst the random appeal to the writings of LUTHER, and the whole body of the confessions of all the Reformed Churches, p. 66, as it particularizes nothing, proves nothing. Previously to the writings of LUTHER, and the confessions of the Reformed Churches, bearing evidence to the "real sense of the articles and doctrines of our Reformers," for which purpose they are appealed to by Mr. O.; it must be proved, that these writings and confessions constituted the standard by which the sentiments of our Reformers were framed. But Mr. O. should have known, or, if he did, he ought to have informed his reader, that a close intimacy subsisted between CRANMER and ERASMUS. To CRANMER, it is presumed, that ERASMUS made a present of the Treatise he wrote against LUTHER's famous Book, entitled "*De servo Arbitrio*." For this very Treatise, printed at *Antwerp*, is now in the British Museum, signed by himself, "THOMAS CRANMER:" and which he appears, from many passages marked in it, to have read over critically. This Treatise was printed in the year 1524, the same year in which LUTHER wrote his "Commentary on the Galatians."

In the year 1543, CRANMER, with other Bishops and Divines, put forth the "Erudition of the Christian Man." Now it must be supposed, that from the year 1524 to the year 1543, the subjects of Predestination, Grace, Free-will, and Redemption, which were then agitating and dividing the Reformed Churches on the Continent, must also have engaged the serious thoughts of the leading Divines in this country. The consequence was, that in "the Erudition of the Christian Man," the doctrines of Grace and Free-will, are explained in a sense strictly conformable to that of ERASMUS, and in direct opposition to that of LUTHER; and a few years afterwards, the Paraphrase of ERASMUS, not the Commentary of LUTHER, was set up in our Churches. This marked preference, given to the writings of ERASMUS by the leading Divines of the Church of England, proves, almost to demonstration, what the principles were, by which the Reformation in this country was originally conducted. With respect to the confessions of the foreign Reformed Churches, admitting them to be any evidences in this case, Mr. O. should also have informed his readers, that two of them at least, namely, the Augsbург, the supposed model on which our public system was formed, and the Saxon, are in decided contradiction to the position it was his object to establish.

The confessions and declarations of the prisoners in Queen MARY's reign, p. 58, cannot possibly be

considered as *public* documents, by which either our Reformers or our Church stand committed. They contained the opinions of individuals on certain speculative points, to which our Reformers in part did, and in part did not, agree. Nothing, therefore, decided is to be collected from them, relative to the point under consideration. On the subject of *Free-will*, in opposition to the error of the *Free-willers*, our Reformers certainly sought to guard against the extreme of Pelagianism; at the same time that they did not mean to diverge into the opposite extreme maintained by LUTHER and CALVIN. And in opposition to the *Gospellers*, who thought that if they magnified CHRIST much, and depended on his merits, they could not perish, which way soever they led their lives; the object of our Reformers was so to guard against the corrupt doctrines of Romish merit, that whilst they maintained, on the one hand, that the salvation of mankind was to be wholly ascribed to the merits of CHRIST; they at the same time taught, that there was no salvation through CHRIST, but to such as truly repented, and lived according to the rules of the Gospel. The whole matter being so ordered, for the express purpose of teaching the members of our Church, that, avoiding the hurtful errors on both sides, they might all know the true and certain way of attaining eternal happiness.\*

\* BURNET'S Hist. Ref. vol. ii. book I, p. 27.

Thus far our Reformers and the prisoners, whose evidence is here appealed to, might be agreed in sentiment. At the same time it appears, that on the subject of Election, which constituted the foundation of Calvinism, they were not so perfectly agreed. BRADFORD, one of the most distinguished of these prisoners, wrote a Treatise on GOD's election, and sent it to the Bishops CRANMER, RIDLEY, and LATIMER, when confined at Oxford, for their approbation. But the circumstance of this Treatise, having been entirely suppressed by BRADFORD, authorises the conclusion, that it did not obtain the sanction of the venerable Martyrs; a conclusion which is supported by the Letter written by RIDLEY to BRADFORD on the occasion, of which notice has been already taken. At the same time, BRADFORD himself was not without his doubts, whether the Bishops might see this subject in the same view with himself; for in his letter to them, he says, "The matter may be thought not so necessary as I make it."\*

From the foregoing abstract of Mr. O.'s general testimony it will appear, that no evidence has been brought forward, by any means sufficiently decided, to establish the Calvinistic sentiments of our *original* Reformers. The evidence adduced for the purpose, when analyzed, will be found, for the most part, made up of authority received at second hand, the weight of which remains to be determined by the

\* BRADFORD's Letter to CRANMER, RIDLEY, and LATIMER. See STRYPE's Life of CRANMER, Appendix.

competent knowledge and judgment of the party; of documents, some of which prove nothing, others the direct contrary position to that which they were brought to support; whilst several public documents, in consequence of Mr. O.'s imperfect acquaintance with the ecclesiastical history of his country, or want of recollection, have been omitted, which speak most decidedly to the point. I repeat, Mr. O.'s imperfect acquaintance with the ecclesiastical history of his country, or want of recollection; because I cannot persuade myself, that, recollecting such documents to exist, Mr. O. could have kept them back from the knowledge of his readers.

Having arrived at this stage, it will be expected that I now proceed to state the point, according to the judgment I have been led to form upon it. This, considering the subject has been so often and so completely handled, as to preclude the possibility of any thing new being said upon it, shall be done with as much brevity as may be consistent with perspicuity. But on this, as on most other subjects of human speculation, there are different degrees of proof to be appreciated; because in proportion to the aggregate mass of evidence, to which each degree of proof shall have contributed, will the conviction be. By way of prelude, therefore, to those decisive documents or circumstances, which appear to speak an unequivocal language on this occasion, it will be proper to state some few preliminary observations; which,



though not amounting to *absolute*, may yet be considered as containing *presumptive* proof of a position, in contradiction to Mr. O.'s assertion, relative to the Calvinistic sentiments of our Reformers.

Now, as the further we remove from the source of any natural stream, the more mixed and corrupt will its quality be; so the nearer we advance to the fountain of any truth, the less adulterate, generally speaking, will it be found. On the supposition, then, that Calvinism was the doctrine intended to be established by our Articles, the nearer we approached to the origin of those Articles, the plainer would be the traces of this original doctrine. Whereas, to those perfectly acquainted with the ecclesiastical history of this country, the reverse of this is known to be the case. Calvinism, for more than the first half century after the Reformation, increased in proportion to its distance from its supposed original. Calvinism in fact grew with Puritanism, till it had advanced to that state, that it became a matter of some difficulty to separate the genuine doctrines of the cross, from the corrupt mixture, which, by degrees, had been blended with them. The presumptive conclusion to which this observation leads, is obviously this—that the Calvinistic doctrine was not the doctrine originally established by our Reformers; but that it gradually mixed itself with their doctrine, and by degrees corrupted it, as the stream of Reformation flowed onward in its course.

The next consideration respects the characters of our Reformers, together with some particular circumstances which attended the infancy of our Reformation. It has been excellently observed, that, "if amidst so much that is admirable in the character and conduct of the first Reformers, we might be permitted to allot the meed of praise to any particular part, there should be no hesitation in assigning it to that singular moderation and discernment, which distinguished the Reformation from all other Revolutions; which, overcoming the common infirmities of our nature, by which men are apt to run from one extreme into its opposite, controuled the spirit of innovation in the moment of reform; rejected nothing without examination, retained nothing without authority, and when it abjured the usurpations of the Church of Rome, discarded only its corruptions, and left all that had the stamp of Christianity behind, like the fire, which consumes the dross, but preserves and refines all that was pure in the ore."\* Those venerable prelates who took the lead in our Reformation, were not more distinguished by their piety, than by their learning and moderation. They knew where to draw the line between the genuine doctrines of Christianity, and the errors that had been grafted upon them; and they drew it with a strong and steady hand. Profiting by

\* Answer to the Question, "Why are you a Churchman?" by the Rev. T. G. TAYLOR.

the intemperate conduct of some foreign Reformers, they carried on their work, not as those Reformers for the most part did, with heat and violence; but with the deliberation and judgment, best suited to a work of wisdom. Instead, therefore, of adopting the writings of LUTHER for their model, or employing CALVIN as their counsel, in bringing to perfection the great work in which they were engaged; they had recourse to the very men, who had been the distinguished opponents of them both—ERASMUS, who had written against the extravagancies of LUTHER, and MELANCTHON, who had decidedly protested against the intemperance and peculiarities of CALVIN. From such circumstances the fair presumption is, that our first Reformers could not be *Calvinistically* disposed.

It moreover deserves consideration, that CRANMER (as the historian\* informs us) proposed to MELANCTHON, in the year 1548, the drawing up of a book of Articles and Heads of Christian faith and practice. MELANCTHON in answer gave his opinion, that this confession should be formed much after the nature of their confession of Augsburgh. The great character which MOSHEIM† has given of MELANCTHON, justifies CRANMER's application to him on this important occasion; whilst the high sense entertained by our Reformers of his abilities and temper,

\* STRYPE's Life of CRANMER, p. 407, 408.

† MOSHEIM, vol. ii. p. 25.

renders it most probable that all due attention was paid to his opinion. The Augsburgh confession is known to have proceeded from the admirable pen of MELANCTHON; and it has been generally understood, that our system of faith was formed upon that model. The Augsburgh confession, then, it is to be marked, was silent on the subject of Predestination, which constituted the grand foundation on which the peculiar tenets of CALVIN were built. At the same time it must be remembered, that in the year 152, (as it has been already noticed) when our Articles were just finished, MELANCTHON with his own hand erased the Article "*de Electione*" out of a script of CALVIN's; a circumstance which gave no small offence to that Reformer. To which must be added this further remark; that in the Saxonian confession, published by MELANCTHON in the same year with our Articles, a passage was inserted, plainly analogous to the concluding clause in our Seventeenth Article, relative to the general nature of the divine promises. "And because (says this Confession) we propose to administer consolation to the consciences of the penitent, we forbear any questions about predestination or election. We lead all our readers to the word of God, and desire them to learn his will from his own word, and not to search after other speculations. Most certainly as the preaching of repentance relates to all men, and implies an accusation against all, so the promise is universal; and the offer

of forgiveness is made to all, according to those general declarations of holy writ—'Come unto me *all* ye that travail and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest. *Whofoever* believeth in Him, shall not perish, but have everlasting life. The same LORD is rich unto *all* who call upon him.' In these universal promises let *each person* believe that he himself is included, and not give way to despair."\*

The proof drawn from the foregoing considerations, taken together, appears so strong, that the cause might be left to rest upon it, in the confidence, that with all unprejudiced minds the conclusion would be, that the public system of our faith, as compiled by our original Reformers, could not possibly be meant to be received in a *Calvinistic sense*.

From these presumptive proofs I now proceed to positive; namely, to proofs drawn from those documents and circumstances which speak a more public and consequently more decided language, from which my reader will have it in his power to judge of the competency of Mr. O.'s evidence, to the establishment of the point which he had in view.

The first document to which appeal is made, and of which Mr. O. takes no notice, is the preface to the edition of the Homilies in 1562. In this same year the present code of Articles received the sanction of both Houses of Convocation. The Seventeenth Article stands the same (with the difference only of

\* Saxon confess. De remissione peccatorum, et de justificatione.

two trifling alterations, and the addition of the concluding *caveat*) as it did in the original edition in the year 1552. By adopting the language of the Article, then, the Reformers in 1562 must be considered as adopting the sense annexed to it by its original framers. That sense has been proved, so far as presumptive proof can go, *not* to be *Calvinistical*. In the preface to the Homilies, in the year 1562, the Queen's design in the publication is thus set forth:—"That all her people, of what degree or condition soever they be, may learn how to invoke, and call upon the name of God, and know what duty they owe both to God and man, so that they may pray, believe, and work according to knowledge, while they shall live here, and after this life be with Him, that with his blood *bath bought us all*." From this document the incontrovertible conclusion is, that the divines in 1562, who built on the foundation originally laid in King EDWARD's reign, did not consider the Calvinistic doctrine of *particular unconditional* election to be the doctrine established by our Church.

The document next in order, which Mr. O. has also passed over unnoticed, is the preface to Archbishop PARKER's edition of the Bishops' Bible. This Bible, originally sent forth by CRANMER, was called the Bishops' Bible, because different parts of its translation were chiefly undertaken by different Bishops of the day. In PARKER's preface to it, on

our Saviour's words, "search the Scriptures," the Archbishop comments thus :—"These words were first spoken to the Jews, but they concern all, of what nation, of what tongue, of what profession soever any man be; for *to all* belongeth it to be called unto eternal life, so many as by the witnesses of the Scriptures desire to find eternal life. *No man, woman, or child, is excluded from this salvation*, and therefore to every one of them is this spoken. For He that hath care of *all*, *accepteth no man's person*; his will is that *all* men should be saved; his will that *all* should come to the way of truth. How could this be more conveniently declared by GOD to man, than when CHRIST, his well-beloved son, our most loving Saviour, the way, the truth, and the life of *us all*, did bid us openly 'search the Scriptures.' Search therefore, good reader, in GOD's name, as CHRIST biddeth thee, the Holy Scriptures, wherein thou mayest find thy salvation, &c." From the evidence furnished by this document it undeniably follows; that in the year 1572, only *ten years* after the promulgation of our present Articles, the governors of our Church did not consider the partial unconditional election of individuals to salvation, to be the established doctrine of the Church of England.

From this document I proceed to state some circumstances which took place towards the end of Queen ELIZABETH's reign, when Calvinism had

\* STRYPE's life of PARKER, p. 406.

made considerable progress in this country. In the year 1595, the Lambeth Articles, which Mr. O. has also passed over unnoticed, were digested and put together, for the purpose of settling the disputes which had taken place at Cambridge on the peculiar tenets of Calvinism. The obvious conclusion from this circumstance is, that the established Articles of our Church were not deemed adequate to the purpose; and for the reason expressly given by WHITACRE to the Archbishop on the occasion, because those tenets "*were not concluded and defined by public authority,*" therefore these Lambeth Articles, as supplementary to our established form, were judged necessary. To prove this, it must be observed, that the Archbishop, in his letter to the heads at Cambridge, on the subject of BARRETT, demanded of them to make good their proceedings against him by any Articles of the Church. But Dr. WHITACRE, in his answer, declining to specify any Article to justify the proceedings against BARRETT, wrote thus:—"For the points of doctrine, we are fully persuaded that Mr. BARRETT hath taught untruth, *if not against the Articles,* yet against the religion of our Church publicly received, &c." To prove, moreover, that these Lambeth Articles did not, even at the time, speak the general sense of the Church of England, it remains to be observed, that they gave great offence, not only in the University, but also at Court, and were immediately suppressed, almost as



soon as they were heard of. These circumstances speak for themselves.

The circumstance which next presents itself to notice, but to which the attention of Mr. O.'s readers has not been directed, respects the conference at Hampton-Court in 1603, when the Lambeth Articles, which had been so suddenly suppressed in 1595, were proposed by the non-conformist ministers to be annexed to our ecclesiastical form. A proposal which was not acceded to on the part of the commissioners for the Church of England, consisting of the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, eight Bishops, seven Deans, and two Doctors. A circumstance which requires no comment.

We pass on to the Synod of DORT, which took place in the year 1618, which has also escaped Mr. O.'s notice, when the divines of the English Church bore public and decided testimony to those Anti-Calvinistic doctrines of universal redemption and free agency; to which circumstance it must be added, that the King, with the greatest part of the Episcopal clergy, highly disapproved the proceedings of the Synod, preferring, as it has been above observed, the sentiments of ARMINIUS to those of GOMARUS and CALVIN.\* These two last circumstances furnish evidence so incompatible with the bold assertion in p. 83, where Mr. O. says, that "there were but four or five maintainers of the

Anti-Calvinistic doctrines, during half a century after the Articles were settled, in the aggregate of divines in the nation," that my reader will not be surprised at their non-appearance.

From noticing the omission of important documents and circumstances, we proceed to examine briefly Mr. O.'s statement of facts; as such examination will furnish a criterion, by which to ascertain the degree of credit due to the historical part of Mr. O.'s publication.

Mr. O. tells his reader in p. 83, that only four or five of the Anti-Calvinistic persuasion were to be found among the great body of English divines, during the period of half a century after the re-settlement of our Church by ELIZABETH: and for the purpose of substantiating the fact, the five opponents of Calvinism are particularized in the margin, by the names of BARO, BARRETT, HARSNETT, BUCKRIDGE, and HOUSON; whilst the account given by Mr. O. of their disgraceful situation is calculated to establish a belief of the unpopularity and heterodoxy of their opinions. "They scarce dared," says Mr. O., "or were not suffered to shew their heads. BARO and BARRETT were driven, at least chose to retire, from their situations in the University, in consequence of the disturbance their opinions occasioned. HOUSON was suspended, and the others only saved themselves by their silence and discretion."

One of Mr. O.'s references on this occasion, is to STRYPE. Our appeal shall be to the same authority; and my reader will judge how far Mr. O.'s statement of this matter corresponds with that delivered by the historian.

Of BARO, STRYPE writes thus:—"It must not be unmentioned, that to him in the midst of his troubles there were not wanting *many* in the University that favoured *his cause*; as Mr. OVERALL, Dr. CLAYTON, HARSNET, and Dr. ANDREWS." And it would have been strange, if there had not been *many* in the University, who had imbibed BARO's sentiments, since he had held lectures, preached sermons, and determined in the schools for the space of fourteen or fifteen years, against the Calvinian tenets, and did not quit his professorship till the regular term of its expiration. BARO, so far from not daring to shew his head, was a man highly respected both in and out of the University; a striking proof of which was given at his funeral, which was attended by all the clergy in London. "OVERALL," who succeeded the high Calvinist Dr. WHITACRE in the regius professorship, "openly and freely confessed his consent to Dr. BARO's positions, as did also Dr. CLAYTON; circumstances which had such weight (says STRYPE) with the Vice-Chancellor as to induce him to shut up the business for the time." From whence it appears, that these four or five

\* Life of WHITGIFT, p. 477.

Anti-Calvinists, the whole number to be found, according to Mr. O., among the aggregate of English divines during half a century, turn out, according to STRYPE, to be *many*, existing at the same time in the University of Cambridge, that chief seat of Calvinism, *only*; with the distinguished names of OVERALL, CLAYTON, and ANDREWS, neither of whom Mr. O. has noticed, at their head. With respect to HARNET, whom Mr. O. describes as scarce daring to appear, it must be observed, that so far from receiving any check for the most decided sermon against the Calvinian tenets, preached by him at PAUL'S cross, where, generally speaking, the Privy Council, Bishops, and Judges, made part of the audience; he was in the succeeding reign, in consequence of WHITGIFT'S recommendation, made Bishop of CHICHESTER, and afterwards proceeded to the Archbishoprick of YORK.

On the subject of BARRETT, another of Mr. O.'s five condemned Anti-Calvinists,\* STRYPE introduces the letter written by him to the Archbishop, containing evidence which ought to have been brought before the reader. In this letter BARRETT says, "that his greatest enemy, Dr. SOME, had brought letters to his Grace, which, he would say, were not so much brought and sent by him, as by the *common consent* of the University. That it was true, they consented and agreed; but that himself was the great

\* Life of WHITGIFT, p. 438.

lover and solicitor. That he had secretly solicited all the University men, who he thought favoured his or his opinion, by his friends, viz. certain Puritans, whose labour he used in this matter, and got their votes; yet that many that studied truth and peace had openly denied him. But that some whom parliament and the Doctor had made hot, hasty and outrageous too, agreed presently, commending his counsel, and subscribing their names. But that some besides he brought on his side *pretentiously*; but they were youths whose ignorance in divinity he marvellously abused. And some they did not draw, but drag, being tired with importunities, into this rage. So that he (Dr. Soms) and other principal men of that opinion, what they endeavoured among them (in the University) had easily obtained; and that a great many of these subscribers were newly made masters of arts, and were neither divines, nor had scarcely saluted the threshold of divinity; protesting upon his death to the truth of what he related to his Grace.

"The Archbishop" (STRYPE proceeds to observe) "condemned the hasty and harsh proceedings against BARKETT, and said that in some points they had made him affirm that which was contrary to the doctrine, and expressed by many sound and learned divines in the Church of England, and in other Churches; and that which, for his own part, he thought to be false and contrary to the Scriptures.

For the Scriptures were plain that God, by his absolute will, did not hate and reject any man without an eye to his sin; neither was it contrary to *any article of religion*, established by authority in this Church of England, but rather *agreeable thereto*.”\*

From whence it appears, that the Archbishop's sentiments on the predestinarian tenets did by no means come up to the then Cambridge standard. Whilst the treatment received by Mr. BARRETT proves nothing so much as that harsh spirit of intolerance, by which Calvinists, after the example of their prototype, have been ever distinguished; a spirit which can do no credit to any cause, and from which no decisive evidence can be drawn. To this *decisive evidence*, however, (as Mr O. calls it) to which he considers all the opponents of Calvinism bound to abandon their cause, Mr. O. thus adds:—  
“ Still Mr. D. will have it, that Calvinism was not entertained by many learned men of the University of Cambridge, till the year 1595.” What, it may be asked, is become of Mr. O.'s favourite authority, STRYPE? Had he kept the historian's pages open before him, instead of objecting to the statement contained in the foregoing sentence, he would have written under it, *Patet*; for in turning to page 435 of STRYPE's life of WHITGIFT, he would have read thus:—“ CALVIN, the great foreign Reformer, (says STRYPE, under the year 1595) his

\* STRYPE's life of WHITGIFT, p. 441.

way of explaining the Divine decrees of predestination was not entertained by *many* learned men in the University of Cambridge. But out of veneration for the man that had deserved so well of the Church of CHRIST, it *was*, (1595) about the latter time of the Queen's reign, prevailed strongly there, having the countenance of some of the chief heads." The evidence of STRYPE, thus brought before my reader, renders further remark on this part of Mr. O.'s publication unnecessary. I pass on, therefore, to the next document, which presents itself, of which, from Mr. O.'s imperfect statement of facts, his reader cannot be qualified to form a competent judgment, namely, the Declaration prefixed to our Articles.

The particulars relative to this Declaration have been already laid before my reader; it is only necessary, therefore, at present, that I advert to those parts of the historical narrative, which Mr. O. has kept out of sight. Part of Mr. O.'s charge against his opponents is for their supposed evasion of that plain, literal, grammatical sense of the Articles, which the Declaration in question was designed to secure. But Mr. O. has omitted to inform his readers, that the Calvinists of that day exclaimed

\* "At that time (says WATERLAND) Calvinism appears to have prevailed at Cambridge, beyond what it had *formerly* done. The seeds had been sown by CARTWRIGHT, while he was Margaret Professor there; and the learned WHITACRE, who was made Regius Professor in 1580, very much promoted and furthered their growth."—Supplement to case of Arias Sub. p. 45.

against this Declaration on this very account, complaining loudly that it prevented Godly ministers from preaching the comfortable doctrines of God's free grace in election, and promoted the growth of Arminianism; in which persuasion they drew up an address to the King for its repeal.\* But this declaration was set forth to the end, "that no man should draw the Article aside any way, but submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but take it in the literal and grammatical sense." An address, therefore, for the repeal of such Declaration, on the ground of its restraining ministers from preaching the *Calvinistic* doctrine "of God's free grace in election," amounts to a confession on their parts, that *such* doctrine could not be preached consistently with the literal and grammatical sense of the Article, and without drawing the Article aside; which was in other words to say, that the Article in question was not *in itself Calvinistical*. According to Mr. O.'s history of this injunction, (the decided Anti-Calvinist LAUD, the procurer of it, having been first converted into a *mild Calvinist*) the full, literal, grammatical sense, for the support of which this Declaration was set forth, is represented as securing that Calvinistic meaning of the Articles which Mr. O. maintains; whereas from the tenor of the Declaration itself, which Mr. O. has not brought

\* COLLIER, vol. ii. p. 746.



before his readers, the object of it appears to have been that of laying the predestinarian controversy at rest, by directing, in the words of the Declaration, that “all further curious search be laid aside, and that these disputes, relative to predestination, should be shut up in God’s promises, as they be *generally* set forth in the holy Scripture, and the *general* meaning of the Articles.” And in consequence of its being *thus* understood by the Calvinists of that day, what they considered to be the object of this Declaration, and what really was its object, namely, to put a stop to the quinquarticular controversy, was made the ground of their inveterate proceedings against its author. BOWMAN, who appears to have been a Calvinist in the full sense of that title, in his review of the doctrines of the Reformers printed in 1768, has observed, “that an Archbishop (LAUD) was brought to the bar, condemned, and executed, among other things, for *introducing Arminianism*.” Such was in those days the spirit of Calvinism. And when it is considered, that the same party which brought LAUD to the block, afterward overturned to the foundation the constitution of their country, both in Church and State; such a consideration, it is presumed, will not be very favourable to a cause, which, under the guise of a purer religion, led to so irreligious, so diabolical a conclusion.

A modern Calvinist, however, tells us, “that the Articles of the Church are *only capable of a Calvinistic*

*sense*,"\* ; and Mr. O. considers the literal and grammatical sense a security for the *Calvinistic sense*. The Calvinists, in Queen ELIZABETH's days, acknowledged, through WHITACRE to the Archbishop, that the Calvinistic points then disputing at Cambridge, for the settlement of, which a new set of Articles were deemed necessary, "*were not concluded and defined by public authority*;" for which reason they did not attempt, though challenged so to do, to support their prosecution against BARRET; on the ground of his doctrine being *contrary to the Articles of the Church*. The Calvinists in King CHARLES's days considered the Declaration made for securing the plain, literal, grammatical sense of the Articles, as *decidedly exclusive* of their own favourite doctrines. Before, then, any man of understanding is called upon to admit the Calvinistic interpretation now attempted to be maintained; the least that can be expected is, that it should be made appear, how that sense, which Calvinists confessedly could not find in our Articles at the two distinguished periods of our history above-mentioned, is now to be so *clearly and definitively* drawn from them, as to justify the charge of *heterodoxy* being brought against every minister of our Church who does not subscribe to it.

\* The Church of England vindicated by a Presbyter of the Church of England. Octavo, 1801.

Having thus far recapitulated, for the purpose of enabling my reader to form a judgment of that part of Mr. O.'s publication, to which his attention has been hitherto directed; a few words only need be said, relative to that most decisive proof, which the Homilies, Articles, and Liturgy, considered as deliberate compositions of the same judicious Reformers, for the use of the Clergy of the same Church, are calculated to furnish. Admitting this principle, which is presumed to be incontrovertible, that our Reformers, in the compilation of our public Forms, could not mean to contradict themselves, by requiring the Clergy to subscribe to one doctrine and preach another, it follows, that the Articles of our Church were not intended by them to be *Calvinistically* interpreted. For the Liturgy, on the subject of *universal redemption*, that ground on which the peculiarities of CALVIN were built, is confessedly and decidedly *Anti-Calvinistic*. The only *postulatum*, therefore, required on this occasion is, that *partial* redemption and *universal* redemption cannot constitute the doctrine of the same Church; and it has always been a matter to me unaccountable, how a Calvinist can reconcile the use of numberless parts of that excellent Liturgy, with the peculiar doctrines he professes to maintain. Such is the ground on which this subject was placed in my fourth Letter to SIR RICHARD HILL; ground, I am inclined to

think, not to be shaken.\* Mr. O., in his allusion to it, in p. 93, has only proved, how much easier it is to SNEER at an argument, than to *answer* it.

In a word, the more the particular circumstances which attended the Reformation in this country are adverted to; the more the character of our Reformers is known, and the simplicity of their writings considered, abstractedly from those vain speculations and nice distinctions which have by degrees been mixed with this subject; the more decided will be the conviction, that the general *evangelical* doctrine of Scripture, as held by the Primitive Church, before the sense of Predestination CALVIN made the foundation of the Covenant of Grace was ever dreamt of, was the doctrine meant to be established in our Church. Such is the conclusion, which an impartial and general review of this complicated subject has led me to draw; a conclusion, which no evidence or argument, that either Scripture, history, or reason, can fairly be made to furnish, will, I trust, prove competent to set aside.

It would, however, be to do injustice to Mr. O., were I not to observe, that he protests against being considered an advocate for Calvinism in *its full extent*; p. 93. Far be it from me to push Mr. O. to any extreme, to which he himself does not wish to proceed, or to make him responsible for the con-

\* The strength of this ground has been particularly pointed out by the DEAN of BARNABURGH.

sequences of any tenets which he himself professedly disavows.

At the same time, I should not do justice to my readers, were I to omit observing on the present point, relative to the partial admission of Calvinism, (by which some well-meaning, though not well-informed Christians are led to relish what they call a *little Calvinism*) that Mr. O. appears to deceive both himself and his readers. "Our Reformers," he says, p. 95, "wished unequivocally to teach that man's salvation is wholly of grace, but that his perdition is of himself; and neither to make God the author of sin, nor man a mere machine, and unfit to be treated as a moral agent." Then our Reformers were no Calvinists; and Mr. O. and myself are thus far agreed. But Mr. O. adds, "this is not in the smallest degree belying the principles we have ascribed to them, and mutilating the subject." Here we are obliged to differ from Mr. O., because the Calvinistic principles ascribed to our Reformers are evidently incompatible with the positions here laid down. Election, *Calvinistically* understood, certainly mutilates the doctrine of salvation by grace, by confining that to some chosen individuals, to the exclusion of all others, which, according to the Divine will, was designed for the benefit of all.—"Who will have *all* men be saved. Who gave himself a ransom for *all*." "Who tasted death for *every* man."—1 Tim. ii. 4; Heb. ii. 9.

But Mr. O. obviates this objection by the introduction of a *single* word:—"The Church of England," says he, p. 95, "unequivocally inculcates the doctrines now often termed *moderate Calvinism*." The Christian professor is guarded against taking things upon trust; being directed "to prove all things, and to hold fast only that which is good." Under the specious title of *moderate Calvinism*, *real Calvinism* may be, and often is, received in disguise; for few of those well-meaning persons who talk of *moderate Calvinism*, know what Calvinism really is, much less do they know where to draw the line of separation between the doctrines of grace as revealed in Scripture, and those peculiar tenets of CALVIN, by which those doctrines have been corrupted. What are the peculiar tenets of Calvinism have been above sufficiently pointed out; no definition, therefore, can be required on that subject. But what is to be understood by this distinction between *moderate* and *immoderate Calvinism*, my reader may yet have to learn. The only information I can give him on this head, must be derived from Mr. O.'s pages, which I proceed to analyze for that purpose.

Mr. O. says, (p. 355) that "the fundamental principles on which the Calvinistic system rests, are *incontrovertible*. Had not the glorious Being who created the world, a right to create it for what purpose he pleased?" The question is not what the Divine Being has a right to do, (for this is a

question as unfit to be proposed, as to be answered) but what that Being has *thought fit* to do in his great works of creation and redemption; and this can be known only from Revelation. We do not, therefore, call into question the *right* of the Creator to dispose of his own work according to his own sovereign will; but the presumption of those who, not satisfied with what has been revealed, attempt to make a will for that Creator, which sets the Divine attributes at variance with each other, and makes Him contradict Himself. The unscriptural doctrine of *absolute decrees* is known to constitute the *foundation* of the Calvinistic system. In holding, then, the *fundamental* principles of that system to be *incontrovertible*, Mr. O. must hold the doctrine of *absolute decrees*: it is otherwise incumbent on him to prove, how the disavowal of absolute decrees is compatible with this boasted incontrovertibility of the Calvinistic system. But Mr. O. attempts to qualify Calvinism, by introducing the plausible epithet *moderate* into the composition. What, then, is meant by this new-fashioned term, *moderate Calvinism*? By *moderate Calvinism* must be understood what is at least in some degree Calvinistic; otherwise the word Calvinism is improperly applied. But *moderate Calvinism* appears to me to be a contradiction in terms; for Calvinism, considered in its essence, is a doctrine made up of frightful extremes. The annexing the epithet *moderate* to it, is something like enveloping a

nauseous medicine with wafer paper, to render it less unpalatable to the patient, and more easy to his swallow; and I am inclined to think, that one of the greatest fallacies, of which there are many to be found in Mr. O.'s book, lies concealed under this specious guise.

The necessary enquiry, then, in this case is, (and every nominally moderate Calvinist, not willing to impose on himself, should scrupulously make it) what portion of the immoderate tenets of CALVIN are rejected, and what retained, in order to constitute this new-fashioned composition, called *moderate Calvinism*. In justice to his readers, a precise definition on this head should have been furnished by Mr. O., to enable them to understand by what process a doctrine essentially *immoderate* might be reduced to a moderate state, and still preserve its original leading character. But though Mr. O. has not furnished a definition on this subject, he has provided what will answer the purpose still better, namely, a case in point; for on turning over to page 96, we find Sir RICHARD HILL brought forward as an example of a *moderate* Calvinist. After having said, that "these *moderate* doctrines, or the notions of St. AUSTIN, are the doctrines maintained by the divines he is vindicating," Mr. O. proceeds to say, that "there is nothing about the Divine decree of the fall, reprobation, or any other of the doctrines which are properly denominated the *rigours*



of the Calvinistic system, insisted upon in their works. Even the hoary Baronet (Sir RICHARD HILL) who has recently been called a rigid Calvinist and predestinarian, begs leave with AUSTIN to differ, together with some great primitive authorities of our Church, on the side of *moderation*." P. 96.

Mr. O. could not have furnished his reader with an evidence more conclusive. The Calvinism of Sir RICHARD HILL has stood on record for upwards of these thirty years; it is not necessary, therefore, to be particularized: and I have too much respect for the general character of the worthy Baronet, to wish to awaken his full-grown prejudices on this particular subject. May they sleep with him in peace!

St. AUSTIN's doctrine upon the subject before us was this—"That God had decreed not to impart his sufficient saving grace to all men in general, but only to a select few, whom he had predestinated to salvation. That the rest of mankind must therefore inevitably perish." CALVIN makes use of rougher language, describing the doctrine thus:—That by GOD's eternal unconditional decree mankind had been divided into elect and reprobate; the former to be certainly saved, the latter to be as certainly damned. The only difference, then, between *rigorous* and *moderate* Calvinism appears to consist, for the most part, in the different manner of describing the same essential doctrine; for the rigorous Cal-

vinist has only not to insist on the Divine decree of the fall, to drop the term *reprobate*, and to say with St. AUSTIN, that those who have not been predestinated by an absolute decree to salvation, "must inevitably perish;" or, according to Sir R. HILL's mode of qualifying this frightful doctrine, to exchange the obnoxious term *reprobation* for the softer one *preterition*, and he immediately becomes what we are to understand by a *moderate Calvinist*. But any person of moderate sense, who is not at the same time a moderate Calvinist, will readily perceive, that between saying, that those who are not elected to salvation *are reprobated*, or *passed over* by God; if, in consequence of the Divine decree, by which their condition has been determined, they *must in either case* "inevitably perish;" there can be no essential difference. In fact, it is only saying the same thing in different ways. From whence it appears, that by *moderate Calvinism* is not to be understood any real alteration in the *essence* of J. CALVIN's doctrine, but only a kind of softening down, as it were, the harsh features of it, for the purpose of procuring for it a more ready currency in the world.

So weak, so fallacious a mode of evading a plain doctrine, which must either be taken together, or not at all, requires no answer from me; because CALVIN who did not mean to impose a doctrine on his disciples under an amphibious title, has answered it for me. "Whom God *passes over*," says he, "he

*reprobatus, &c.*<sup>20</sup> And in one of his letters on this subject, he writes thus to a person who seems to have tried the same mode of evading the plain Calvinistic doctrine, which the moderate Calvinist now practices. "But you, my friend, are very much deceived, if you think that the eternal counsel of the DEITY can be so distinguished, that some should be elected by Him to salvation, at the same time that none are doomed by Him to damnation. For if God has elected *some*, it certainly follows, that *all* are not elected. Moreover, what shall be said of these latter, but that *they are left to perish*? It must be, therefore, that the relation between the *elect* and *reprobate* should mutually correspond."<sup>†</sup>

We now know, then, what is to be understood by *moderation* in Calvinism, from the specimen of it exhibited by Mr. O. in Sir R. HILL. Mr. O., consequently, as a *moderate* Calvinist, maintains the doctrine of the absolute unconditional election of certain chosen individuals, as the foundation of the covenant of grace. That he does so, his late publication furnishes internal evidence. In p. 67, after observing

\* Quos ergo Deus *præteritis*, *reprobat*; neque *aliâ de causâ*, nisi quod ab hereditate, quam filius suis prædestinat, illos *vult excludere*," Instit. lib. iii. cap. 23, 1.

† "Tu vero, mi CHRISTOPHORE, longè falleris, si æternum DEI consilium itâ posse discerni putas, ut quosdam eligeret in salutem, neminem exitio destinaret. Nam si *aliquos* elegit, certe sequitur non *omnes* esse electos. Porro, quid de his dicendum erit; nisi eos relinqui ut pereant? Mutua igitur inter *reprobos* et *electos* relatio fit oportet."—*Calvinus Christophoro Libertate, Cat. 342.*

that I am "above following such a guide **AUSTIN**," Mr. O. proceeds to give me the title "*the zealous opposer of Election*." Now as Mr. O. professes, p. 96, to maintain the notions of **AUSTIN**, and it is the *Calvinistic* sense of election only that I have opposed; it follows, that it is the *Calvinistic* sense of election, so far as it conforms with the notions of **AUSTIN**, that Mr. O. maintains.

Again; in p. 369 Mr. O. writes thus:—"Those who labour to evade the plain sense of the Articles *in some particular points*, do on these points especially attempt to *tamper* with the Scriptures. Thus Mr. D. conceives, that the texts which relate to predestination, are interpreted too literally, and would not have them to be so strictly and philosophically enquired into."

Mr. DAUBENY, then, on the subject of predestination, Mr. O. being the judge, *tampers* with the texts of Scripture supposed to relate to it, for the purpose of evading the plain sense of the Article on this subject. The only text I recollect to have brought forward on this subject, is Rom. ix. 13, relative to the election of **JACOB** in preference to **ESAU**, to inherit and convey the blessing which had been pronounced to faithful **ABRAHAM**, that in his seed all nations should be blessed. On this text I say, "that **GOD** preferred **JACOB** to **ESAU**. And nothing but a vain desire to force texts of Scripture into the support of an ill-founded scheme of a particular election and

reprobation to eternal life, and eternal misery, could induce any one to press the instance of JACOB and ESAU into their service." Guide, p. 93. On this ground it was maintained, in a note subjoined, that "predestination was not to be understood in that particular and exclusive sense, which has been annexed to it by some Christians; but in its general application to that plan of salvation determined upon in the Divine mind, before the foundation of the world; according to which it is the settled purpose of God, that every man shall be saved, who shall, through grace, be found in conformity with that plan, as revealed in Scripture."

By predestination CALVIN understood that eternal decree, by which the future condition of every man, before he came into the world, was absolutely determined by the Divine will. CALV. Inst. lib. iii. cap. 21, sect. 5. In the chapter immediately succeeding, the case of JACOB and ESAU is brought forward by CALVIN as a case in point: "The one elected and the other rejected, (or reprobated) that it might be proved that the foundation of Divine predestination did not stand upon works."\* And that the Apostle did not say in answer to the ques-

\* Alterum electum, alterum reiectum; ut probet divinæ prædestinationis fundamentum in operibus non esse."—"In hunc finem excitentur reprobi, ut DEI gloria per illos illustretur, &c. Ergo si non possumus rationem assignare, cur suos misericordia dignetur, nisi quoniam *ita Illi placet*, neque etiam in aliis reprobandis aliud habebimus quam *Ejus voluntatem*, &c."—CALV. Inst. lib. iii. cap. 22.

tion, "Is there unrighteousness with God? that God had repaid ESAU according to his wickedness; but contents himself with this different solution of the matter, that the reprobate are raised up for this express purpose, that the glory of God may be manifested by them:" upon the principle immediately subjoined, "that GOD will have mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth." So that the different condition of the elect and reprobate is wholly resolved by CALVIN into the sole and absolute will of the DEITY. "We can assign no reason," says he, "for his vouchsafing mercy to his elect, but that it is his pleasure so to do; nor shall we have any other reason to give for his *reprobation* of others, but that it is his will."—Thus much for CALVIN's interpretation of the Apostle's text.

We will now turn to that of Bishop HOOPER, the only one, of all our original Reformers, whom Mr. O. has ventured to quote in favour of the Calvinistic design of the Articles, who, in his Preface to his Declaration of the Ten Commandments, published in 1549, wrote thus:—After shewing, on the ground of the Apostle, that the promise of grace in CHRIST was as universally extended as was ADAM's sin, he thus proceeds to illustrate the position; "The promise of grace, (says he) appertaineth to every sort of men in the world, and comprehendeth them *all*; howbeit within certain limits and bounds, the which

if men neglect or pass over, *they exclude themselves* from the promise in CHRIST; as CAIN was no more excluded, till he excluded himself than ABEL; SAUL than DAVID; JUDAS, than PETER; *Esau than Jacob*. By the Scripture it seemeth, that the sentence of God was given to save the one, and to damn the other, before the one loved God, or the other hated God. Howbeit these threatnings of God against ESAU, if he had not of *his wilful malice excluded himself* from the promise of grace, should no more have hindered his salvation than God's threatnings against Nineveh, which, notwithstanding that God said should be destroyed within forty days, stood a great time after, and did penance." And then, after observing that nothing is mentioned in that place respecting ESAU being disinherited of eternal life, the Bishop thus proceeds: "Wherein God loved JACOB, the text declareth. God transferred the right and title that appertained unto ESAU the elder brother, to JACOB the younger. Likewise, the land that was promised unto ABRAHAM and ISAAC, was by legacy and testament given unto JACOB and his posterities. St. PAUL useth this example of JACOB and ESAU, *for none other purpose*, but to take away from the Jews the thing that they most put their trust in, to say, the vain hope they had in the carnal lineage and natural descent from the family and household of ABRAHAM, and likewise the false confidence they had in the keeping of the law of MOSES."

My reader has now the evidence before him, from which it appears in what school I have been taught; if therefore there has been any *tampering* with the text of St. PAUL on this subject, the blame must be laid where it originated.

CRANMER, another of our reformers, with the view of countervailing the mis-persuasions that prevailed on the subject of faith, employed Dr. REDMAYN, the most learned and judicious divine, to write a treatise on the subject; in which it is said, "but for the definition of faith, which some proposed, as if it were a certainty that one was predestinated, the Reformers *found nothing of it*, either in the Scriptures or the Doctors, and thought that could not be known; for though God never failed in his promises to men, yet such was the frailty of men, that they often failed in their promises to God, and so did forfeit their right to the promises, which are all made upon *conditions that depend on us*."\* CRANMER, then, did not see predestination in the light in which CALVIN saw it, and consequently could not apply the case of JACOB and ESAU as he did.

To this testimony of our Reformers may be added that of our Church. Our Church, in her service, considers every child placed by baptism in the number of God's "*faithful and elect children*." Election, then, according to the sense in which it is thus used by our Church, corresponds with the sense in which

\* BURNETT'S Hist. Ref. vol. i. p. 286.



that word is used in the sacred writings, when applied to the Gospel dispensation. The election to which the Gentiles succeeded, was an election of grace to the privileges of that Gospel covenant, which the Jews, considered as a nation, rejected. In reference to which original application of this word to the case of the Jews, as depositaries of the oracles of God, the word *elect*\* is applied by the Apostles to the members of whole Churches, in their collective capacity, as referring to that act of Divine grace by which the knowledge of the Gospel had been vouchsafed to that district where those Churches were established. In the same sense, our Church uses the word *elect*, not with reference to any certain unconditional election to final salvation, but as signifying the gracious election of the baptized parties to Gospel privileges, of which, by their admission into the Church, they had been made partakers, and upon their use or abuse of which their final condition was to depend.

The subject before us, then, is here brought to a short issue. For the point in this case to be

\* "The *election* spoken of in Scripture is meant of people, nations, or churches, as we may see by the following texts:—1 Peter i. 1, 2, 5, 13; Genesis xxv. 23; Acts x. 35.—"Now pray observe," says that excellent divine, the late Mr. Jones, "this *election* comes first in order, and separates Christians from the world; but there is still a judgment to come, which will separate *good* Christians from *bad* Christians. They who confound these two things, *present election* and *future judgment*, do greatly err; and they who teach others to confound them, err still more."—*Jones's 2d Letter to a Predestinarian.*

determined is not, whether CALVIN or our Reformers tampered with St. PAUL's text in their different interpretations of it, for this is not *coram judice*; but whether the author of "a Guide to the Church, and the great body of the Clergy, who with him adopt a sense of election different from that maintained by the disciples of CALVIN, have the sentiments of our Reformers and the consequent doctrine of the Church of England *with them, or not?* In other words, "whose doctrine (of election) is really that of our Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy? Who, in reality, teach (that doctrine) contained in these Formularies, as it was first delivered by our Reformers?"\* A point, which, with the evidence here laid before him, no reader can, I think, be at any loss to determine.

After what has been so fully said on the Chapter on *Justification*, a few words will be sufficient to recal my reader's attention to that part of this subject, in which Mr. O. differs not less from the doctrine of the Primitive Church, than from that of the Church of England.

In p. 179 Mr. O. adopts CRANMER's definition of justification; at the same time that he rejects CRANMER's application of it, by confining the benefit of justification only to subjects capable of faith, that is, to "a man when he rightly believes;" infants, conse-

\* OVERTON, p. 17.

quently, not being of age capable of faith and repentance, are by Mr. O. excluded from it. It does not follow, he says, because ~~man being of age is~~ justified by baptism, that "therefore those who are not capable of faith and repentance, are justified" by it. P. 181. In conformity with which idea, baptism, which by the ancients was considered to contain the first principle of all spiritual life, and the essence of justification, instead of being represented as the seal of the Gospel covenant on the part of God, and the outward sign of an inward spiritual grace actually conveyed to the baptized party, is described by Mr. O. as "the bare admission into the Christian religion." P. 180. On this subject Mr. O. discovers a total ignorance of the doctrine of the Primitive Church. The uniform doctrine of which certainly was, that baptism *rightly* administered was the outward mean or instrument of justification, the appointed form or rite, by which that grace was conveyed on the part of God to the baptized party. Sufficient proof having been already brought on this head, I shall here only bring back to my reader's memory the decisive judgment of AUGUSTIN in favour of infants; with whose works it may be expected, from his confident manner in pages 66, 67, 68, that Mr. O. is well acquainted. In answer to Mr. O.'s objection to justification by baptism, founded on the incapacity of infants for faith and repentance, AUG-

TRIN tells him, that “ the infant, though not possessing that faith, which consists in the will of the believing party, is yet made *faithful* by the sacrament of that faith; and is called *faithful*, not by the assent of his own mind, but by the participation of the sacrament of the thing itself. For where do we place baptized infants, but among the *faithful*? Such is the voice of the universal Church.”\* “ The infant (says he† in another place) does not lose the grace that has been once received, unless through his own impiety, when he may be considered to be arrived at an age to have his *own proper* sins. In every other case, having been regenerate and made a child of God by baptism, the grace of justification at that time conveyed is considered to be compleat.” “ Who-  
ever§ (therefore) denies that infants are by baptism delivered from perdition, and obtain eternal salva-

\* Parvulum, etsi nondum fides illa, quæ in credentium voluntate consistit, jam tamen ipsius fidei sacramentum *fidelem* facit.—*Fidelis* vocatur, non rem ipsa mente annuendo, sed ipsius rei sacramentum percipiendo.—*August. ad Bonif. Ep.* 98.

Ubi ergo parvulos ponimus *Capitizatos*, nisi inter *fideles*; sicut *universæ* ecclesiæ clamat auctoritas?—*August. de Peccat. Merit.* l. i. chap. 33, p. 35.

† Semel perceptam parvulus gratiam non amittit, nisi *propria impietate*, si ætatis accessu tam malus evaserit.—*August. ad Bonif. Ep.* 98.

In Infantibus, qui baptizati moriuntur, eadem gratia Omnipotentis implere credenda est, &c.—*August. de Baptis.* l. v. c. 24.

§ Quicumque negat parvulos per baptismum Christi D<sup>i</sup> perditione liberari, et salutem percipere *sempiternam*, anathema.

*Concil. Carthag. in Augustin, Epist.* 175, p. 620.

tion, let him be anathema." With this uniform doctrine of the Primitive Church, that of the Church of England strictly corresponds. Our Reformers, considering *original sin* (the only sin with which infants can be chargeable) as remitted by baptism, in speaking of baptised infants, used the words "*baptized or justified*" as synonymous terms. Which Mr. O. appears not to admit; (p. 180) although our Reformers, in the same Homily where these words thus synonymously used occur, write thus: "Infants being baptized, and dying in their infancy, are by his sacrifice washed from their sins, and brought to GOD's favour."\* Under such circumstances then, their condition corresponds with that definition of justification which Mr. O. has adopted; "they have the forgiveness of sins, are accepted, and reputed just and righteous in GOD's sight; on which ground, our Church declares them to be "*undoubtedly saved.*"† Such is the doctrine of

I shall subjoin only Chrysostom's Account of Baptism, by way of Appendix to that of Austin:—"You are *herein* (says this goodly Father) made not only *free*, but *holy*, not only *holy*; but *just* likewise; not barely *just*; but *children* also; not *children* only, but *heirs*; not merely heirs, but *brethren* of Christ; not brethren only, but *co-heirs*; not co-heirs only, but *members* also; nor members only, but his *temple*; nor temple only, but *organs* of the Holy Spirit."—*Chrysost. Hom. ad Neophyt.*

\* Homily on Salvation.

† Should further satisfaction on this subject be thought necessary, I refer my reader for it to "A Summary View of the Doctrine of Justification," by Dr. WATERLAND.

the Church of England, as it is to be found in her Homilies, Articles, and Liturgy.

The learned Dr. JACKSON has so luminous a passage on this subject, that I shall have the thanks of my reader for its introduction:—"It is a truth unquestionable, (especially in the doctrine of the Church of England) that as many as are baptized, are *from* their baptism, and *by* their baptism, translated from the estate or condition of sons of wrath to the estate or privilege of the sons of God. This doctrine of our Church is necessarily grounded upon that saying of our Apostle, 'as many of you as have been baptized into CHRIST have put on CHRIST.' Now it is impossible that any should put on CHRIST, and not receive him. And 'to as many as receive him,' saith St. JOHN, 'to them gives he power (right or privilege) to become the sons of God.' But here some will demand, if all that are baptized become the *sons of God*, do they not all likewise, by this new birth, become heirs with CHRIST? Yes. All that are sons are likewise heirs, but not, therefore, *undisinheritable*, because heirs; not, therefore, in the estate of *absolute election*, because they are in the estate of sons of God, or heirs with CHRIST, by baptism. For many whom God hath graciously accepted for his sons; many, who during the time of their infancy have enjoyed the estate or privilege of sons of God, may in riper years turn *prodigal* sons, and *disinherit* themselves; and none can be disin-

herited, but he that hath been in the state and condition of an heir, or until with ESAU he have sold his birth-right. Both parts of this assertion, (1st, that all that are baptized in their infancy become sons of GOD, and during their infancy do *live to GOD*; 2d, that even in such sin may revive, and wound some grievously, others mortally) are included in our Apostle's dispute, Rom. vii. 9—'I was once alive,' saith our Apostle, 'without the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.' Doth he speak this of himself only, or of all men, without exception or restraint, that were without the law? Not *absolutely* of *all* men that were without the law; for so the Gentiles, which were not under the law, which knew not GOD nor his laws, should have been so alive as the Apostle there saith he sometime was, because they were more without the law than he at any time was. Nor doth he speak of himself alone, but of *all such as he was*, i. e. of all such, and only such, as were of the seed of ABRAHAM, and had been circumcised the eighth day, and by circumcision came under the law, though for the present without the law. So that as baptism *now*, so circumcision *then*, did free the children of ABRAHAM from the curse of the law; did translate them from the condition or estate of sons of wrath to the condition or privilege of the sons of GOD. But did the Apostle, or his brethren, who were made alive by circumcision in

their infancy, continue in the same estate of life, ~~until~~ their mortal lives end? No; the Apostle expressly adds, ‘but when the commandment came, ~~sin~~ revived, and I died.’ So that sin, before the commandment came, was dead, and revived when the law came; and the Apostle before the *same point of time* was alive, but *then* died. It is an observation of great use which St. BASIL hath to this purpose in his comment on Psalm i.: ‘When our reason comes once to ripeness or perfection, that is fulfilled which is written, *when the commandment comes, sin revives.*’—St. BASIL, 1 tom. Paris, 1638, fol. 113, Com. on Ps. i. The extract, as well of our Apostle’s speech, as of St. BASIL’s observation on it, confirms the truth before delivered, that the same measure of regeneration, which sufficeth during infancy, sufficeth not to save the same parties, when they come to the use of reason, for *then the commandment comes, and sin revives, &c.*”\*

The title Mr. O. has prefixed to his publication is, “*The true Churchmen ascertained;*” by whom, we understand, persons living in strict conformity to the doctrine and discipline of that Church, of which they are members. From Mr. O.’s doctrine of justification, then, seeing that, so far as it applies to the sacrament of baptism, it is in direct contradiction to the plain language of our Homilies, Articles, and Liturgy, it follows, that to establish his claim to *true Churchmanship*, reference must be had to his con-

\* JACKSON, vol. iii. b. 10, c. 38.



nection with a Church, whose doctrine, on this subject at least, is at decided variance with that of the Church of England; and how Mr. O.'s representation of baptism, as "the bare admission into the Christian religion," p. 180, is reconcileable with his professed acknowledgment of "*one baptism for the remission of sins*," I profess myself incompetent to determine.

On this head, however, it is unnecessary to detain the reader; because, from what has been already said upon it, he must clearly perceive, that unless the epithets *general* and *partial* convey the same sense, *baptismal election*, according to our baptismal service, and *Calvinistic election*, cannot possibly co-exist as the doctrine of the same Church; and hence Mr. O.'s attempt to convert the initiatory sacrament of our Church into "a bare admission into the Christian religion," p. 180, is readily to be accounted for. But how an attempt, which contradicts the plain letter of both Homilies, Articles, and Liturgy, is to be reconciled with Mr. O.'s boast of "strict adherence to his guide," (the Church, p. 271) with his support of the *literal* construction of our public forms, or with the title of "true Churchmen," which he has appropriated to himself and his clients; and with what propriety the distinctive word "*regular*" can be applied to *Clergy*, whose doctrine, on the subject of baptism at least, is at decided variance with that of the Church, of which they are accredited ministers; it is for Mr. OVERTON to explain.

On other parts of this subject, the difference between Mr. O., and those of his supposed opponents, who are *sound* ministers of the Church, will, I trust, be found to consist more in words than in things. With Mr. O. the words *evangelical* and *Calvinist* seem almost synonymous. To me they appear perfectly distinct from, and consequently by no means necessarily connected with, each other. A Calvinist is a sound Christian, so far as he maintains the *evangelical* doctrines of the Cross. But to maintain these doctrines, it is not necessary that a divine should be a Calvinist. For every tenet *peculiarly* Calvinistic is not of the essence of those doctrines, but tends to corrupt it. Our Reformers, in their projected restoration of the *evangelical* doctrines professed in the Primitive Church, did not think proper to adopt the system of J. CALVIN as their standard. Now as CALVIN was not consulted in the composition of our theological system, but, on the contrary, his assistance was declined; to refer to CALVIN for the interpretation of it, seems to be the readiest way to misunderstand it. The Bible was the principal authority which our Reformers placed before them; and the more intimately we are acquainted with its general tenor, the less of Calvinism shall we see in our Church forms.

Far be it from me to speak disrespectfully of J. CALVIN, or of any other truly pious man, however I may differ from him in opinion. CALVIN

was certainly a very great theologian ; even of the work which contains his most extravagant positions, many parts are uncommonly fine, and admirably calculated to lessen that pride, which ever proves the greatest stumbling-block in the way of genuine Christianity. At the same time it must be admitted, that his works too frequently afford a melancholy example of very extensive learning, and the greatest natural talents, perverted by a violence of temper, and an unyielding dogmatism, which nothing could either soften or persuade. But to respect CALVIN, and to receive him as an oracle, are two very different things. That he was fallible, he has himself furnished the most decided proof. The very year, I believe, before he published his Institutes, which contain his positions relative to partial unconditional election and reprobation, he sent forth another work, in which, in the most unequivocal language, the very opposite doctrine was maintained. In his Preface to the Gallican edition of the New Testament, published 1535, he writes thus : \*—“ By one CHRIST *the whole human race* were reconciled unto GOD. To that inheritance (namely, of the Father's kingdom) we are called *without respect of persons*,

\* Per unum CHRISTUM *universum humanum genus* reconciliandum erat DEO.—Ad istam hæreditatem (regni Paterni scilicet) vocamur omnes sine personarum acceptatione; masculi, feminae, summi, infimi, &c. Nemo hinc excluditur, qui modo CHRISTUM, qualis offertur a PATRE in salutem omnium, admittat, et admissum complectatur.”—*Prefat. in Gall. Edit. Nov. Test. Neocomi. 1535.*

male and female, high and low, &c. *No one is excluded*, who but receives and embraces CHRIST as he is offered by the Father for the salvation of all."

Another equally striking proof of his fallibility, or contradiction of himself, will be found in the margin,\* by comparing his definition of predestination with his comment on the words of St. JOHN, "Behold the Lamb of God, &c." But whatever respect may be due to the man, in the investigation of truth, the authority of names must not be suffered to weigh down the quality of things. "*Tolle CATONEM de causa*," said CICERO. CATO was a name of virtue, and carried authority with it, and therefore CICERO thought him not a fit witness in the cause against MURÆNA. *Tolle AUGUSTINUM de causâ*; take away the names of AUSTIN and CALVIN; they are *names*, not *arguments*. There is but one name by which we may be saved, and *His* name alone must have authority and prevail with us, who was the Author and Finisher of our Faith. This much is certain, there cannot be any influence in a name, to make a conclusion true or false. Nor is it of so great use, as men may imagine. To them who are

\* "Æterno et immutabili consilio DEUM semel constituisse, quos olim semel assumere vellet in salutem, quos rursùm exitio devovere. Hoc consilium, quoad electos, ingrâtuitâ ejus misericordiâ fundatum esse asserimus, *nullo humanæ dignitatis respectu*."—Instit. l. iii. c. 21, 7. "Nunc vero quod *omnibus* offertur beneficium, amplecti nostrum est; ut statuant *singuli nihil sibi obflare*, quo minùs reconciliationem in CHRISTO obtineant, si modo, duce fide, ad ipsum accedant.—*Calv. Comment. in Johan.*

able to discern error from truth, a name is but a name; for they can look upon the truth and receive it for itself: whilst those of narrower capacity, who take things upon trust, are perhaps as often led by it into error as into truth. It would at least be well, if those names which keep alive prejudices, by which parties in the Christian Church are distinguished, were abolished; and that neither the words *Calvinism* nor *Arminianism* were to be found in the Churchman's vocabulary: for as the theological system of *our* Church was not modelled after the pattern of either, it follows, that neither one nor the other of those particular persuasions can constitute the proper standard; by which the original sense of *it* is to be determined. And as the sober Calvinists, for whom Mr. O. professes to plead, would not be thought to maintain the theological system of CALVIN in its fullest extent; why, it may be asked, should they retain a title, which, whilst meant by them to apply only to some part of that system, is nevertheless generally made use of to give currency to the whole of it?

As ministers of the same Church, who ought "to be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment," let it be "our care to study and preach CHRIST, and him crucified; to work the souls of men to faith, repentance, piety, justice, charity, temperance, and all other heavenly virtues; that they may find cordial testimonies in themselves of their happy predestination to life, and their infallible

interest in the precious blood of their Redeemer. Let us beat down those sins in them, which make them obnoxious to everlasting damnation, and strip them of all comfortable assurances of the favour of God. Let us not indiscreetly spend our time and pains in distracting their thoughts with those scholastical disquisitions, whereof the knowledge or ignorance makes nothing to Heaven. The way to blessedness is not so short, that we should find leisure to make out-roads into needless and unprofitable speculations.”\*

The doctrine of *Predestination*, on which so much stress is now laid by some Christians, as if it were the one thing necessary to salvation, was never heard of in the Church, till Christians amused themselves with raising questions out of the Scriptures, and disputed about many things to no profit. The Scriptures which were able to make TIMOTHY *wise unto salvation*, contained it not. Our SAVIOUR’S Sermon on the Mount, that perfect rule of the Christian life, taught it not. The Apostles on the Day of Pentecost taught it not, when they gave the following direction to their enquiring hearers, “Repent, and be baptized *every one* of you, in the name of JESUS CHRIST, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.” In fact, the Jews were too much filled up with the opinion of their own *election* already. It was the beam which required to be cast *out of their*

\* Bishop Hall’s “*Via Media*,” p. 386.

*eye*; and which now, unhappily for the Church, prevents many Christians from profiting by their mistake.

But from the general tenor of Mr. O's publication, it should seem, as if he thought there was no middle way, between the Calvinistic interpretation of our Articles, and the propagation of absolute Heathenism. To this conclusion at least the reader is led, from his application of passages taken from those respectable divines of our Church, with whose names Mr. O. has graced his pages. But though it would be presumption in me to speak for those among them who are now living, and in a situation to speak with more effect for themselves; still for two divines who are gone, than whom the cause of Christianity has rarely boasted of more zealous and more powerful advocates, I may decidedly speak; because, from a long acquaintance with their principles, I have a satisfaction in thinking, that the view which I have taken of the Christian system essentially corresponds with that which they entertained. The two divines here alluded to are—the late Bishop HORNE, and the Rev. Mr. JONES.

With their zeal, though not with their abilities, I should be happy to co-operate with every sincere and pious Calvinist, in the dissemination of the *genuine doctrines of the Cross*; and where a Christian spirit prevails, this might be done, without offence being given to private opinions on either side. Neither Calvinism nor Anti-Calvinism, abstractedly considered, consti-

tute the precise standard, by which true Christian characters ought definitively to be ascertained; because most conscientious and exemplary Christians have been, and doubtless still are to be, found under each description. It is only when Calvinism, as seems to be attempted in the present day, is made the criterion by which sound divinity is to be determined, that we complain. This is, as it were, to throw down the gauntlet of public challenge; and there never will be wanting, among the faithful sons of our Church, those who will feel themselves called upon to take it up. But all controversies on this subject are to be deprecated; as they tend, generally speaking, more to diminish charity, than to increase knowledge. In this conviction, my wish is not to prolong the present controversy, so much as to close it for ever. "To this end may the God of Peace incline the hearts of men, as to a zeal of truth, so to love of peace. And since we are fallen upon those points, which are disputable to the world's end, may the same God compose the minds of men to a wise moderation, and bind up their lips in a safe and discreet silence; that if our brains must needs differ, yet our hearts and tongues may ever be one."\*

In this hope, I have confined myself chiefly to facts, avoiding, at least intentionally, together with that flippancy of language unsuited to the subject, all those harsh, sneering, and disrespectful expressions, which

\* Conclusion to the "Via Media."



tend more to provoke than to convince ; and which, whenever used in religious controversies, appear to favour too much of that intemperate zeal, to which our SAVIOUR's rebuke in some sort applies, " Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."

Surely, this is not a time for divines of the same Church to engage in verbal contentions, when their whole professional force ought to be united against the common enemy of their faith. And Mr. O. may perhaps think, when he thinks again, that he has not adopted the most judicious method of serving the cause of God and his country, by bringing forward the same indiscriminate charge against the Clergy not *Calvinistically* disposed, which sectarists and itinerants have long been industriously circulating against the Church of England at large, for the purpose of promoting separation from her communion. Mr. O. has not to learn, that in guarding against one extreme, the mind of man is generally apt too incline too much towards its opposite. And the more my reader is acquainted with ecclesiastical history, the more will he be satisfied, that to this too prevailing infirmity of the human intellect, most of the disputes, which have at different times agitated and divided the Church, are to be traced. A master in Israel should, therefore, be as fully qualified to draw the line between the genuine doctrines of grace, and those errors of Calvinism which have been occasionally mixed with them ; as the sound Protestant should be,

to discriminate between the doctrines and practices of the Primitive Church, and those corruptions which have been grafted upon them. In such cases nice discrimination is essential; and if those who exercise it, for the very purpose of guarding against the abuses, to which the doctrines of grace have at all times been more or less subjected; (in the words of Archbishop CRANMER) “ for the purpose of mounishing all, and chiefly preachers, that, looking on both sides, they so attemper and moderate themselves, that neither they *so* preach the grace of GOD, that they take away thereby *free-will*; nor, on the other side, *so* extol free-will, that injury be done to the *grace of GOD*;” if the expressions of writers, having this professed object before them, are to be strained, in order to push them into extremes, against which they are endeavouring to provide the surest remedy, there must be an end to all sound argument on these subjects.

Mr. O.’s publication proceeds, for the most part, on this erroneous plan; and would Mr. O. but give himself time to exercise that judicious discrimination, necessary to the perfect elucidation of nice subjects, the writings of the author of “ A Guide to the Church ” would probably be less offensive to him than they now appear.

To this end the distinctions to be attended to are these:—First, the distinction between the *absolute* and *relative* sense of words; for that may be *true*

in the one sense, which is most *untrue* in the other. This distinction applies to *good works*. In themselves they have no absolute merit, consequently they are not *Popish works*. Still they have a *relative*\* merit, derived from their relation to CHRIST, (having been performed in CHRIST) which renders them acceptable to GOD; and this was all our Reformers meant, when they applied to them the epithet *meritorious*.† The next distinction relates to *cause* and *condition*; the *cause* considered as the producer of the effect, and the *condition* as that *without which* the effect will not take place. The covenant of redemption, for instance, was conceived in grace, is carried on through grace, and finally perfected by grace. Fallen man, therefore, may be said to be saved *by grace* from first to last. The merit of CHRIST is, then, the whole and sole *cause* of man's salvation. At the same time, good works, or holiness, on the part of man, constitute that *indispensable* condition, according to the tenor of the evangelical covenant, *without which* his salvation will not finally take place. With

\* *Non quòd opus*, as says the learned JACKSON, *sed relative*.

† And that this was all that the author of "A Guide to the Church" could mean on this subject, Mr. O. must have been satisfied, when he read the following passage in his letter to Mrs. MORE: "Remembering, that tho' God has been pleased to vouchsafe to man a *title of grace* to salvation, derived from his own performances, by declaring that those 'who do his commandments, have a right to the tree of life.' Rev. xxii. 14. Yet man is, at the same time, to beware of considering his performances, how perfect soever they may be, as the *meritorious cause* of his salvation." P. 5, 6.

On this distinction in view, we understand, how a man is said "to be justified without works," in the language of St. PAUL; and how he is to be "justified by works," in the language of St. JAMES: and consequently (in the words of the judicious HOOKER\*) "how our fathers might hold, that we are justified by faith alone, and yet hold truly, that *without works* we are not justified."

The third distinction respects a right of *grace*, and a right of *service*. In either case the right is established by the performance of the conditions annexed to it. Thus a man may acquire a *right* to the tree of life, under the covenant of Grace, to which, under the covenant of works, he could have no pretension.

The fourth and last thing necessary to be pointed out to attention, respects the distinction between a *certain cause necessarily producing a certain effect*; and the *necessity that a cause should produce such an effect*, to secure its intended object. Faith, to be instrumental to salvation, must necessarily be productive of good works; and *lively* faith, like a fruitful tree, *whilst in that state*, must necessarily be productive. *In this sense*, good-living cannot be separated from true and lively faith. Still the necessity in this case is not of a *physical* but *moral* kind; and therefore must depend for its effect, on the actual condition of that being, whose moral powers have been deranged by the fall.

\* Discourse on Justification.

H H

The foregoing distinctions have nothing to do with Popery, but are best calculated to guard against it; as the most effectual security against error is to know where to trace the precise boundary between error and truth. In conformity with these distinctions, the language of the Primitive Church, of our Reformers, and of the best divines of our Establishment, is to be understood; and what is still more to the purpose, the language of the Bible, as a consistent book, is not to be understood without them. With these distinctions in view, accompanied with that fairness of construction, to which every author is entitled, those objections to my writings, and probably those of others, which Mr. O.'s zeal seems, for the most part, to have created, will, I trust, give way to his more settled judgment; and though a Calvinist himself, that he will conclude with thinking, as in charity he is bound to think, that a divine, who does not see our theological system precisely in the same light as he does, may still be both a *sound* and a *faithful* minister of the Church of England.

Whilst, therefore, we feel ourselves called upon unequivocally to object to some parts of Mr. O.'s conclusion drawn from his own premises, particularly those which relate to *justification*, for the reasons above produced; and most decidedly protest against that general language applied by Mr. O. to those divines who think differently from him, by which

they are represented "as preachers of SOCRATES and SENeca, instead of the everlasting Gospel of the living God;" (p. 410) as if the everlasting Gospel of the living God could be preached faithfully by *none* but the disciples of J. CALVIN, the fallacy contained in which language is to be equalled only by the calumny of it; there are still some parts of Mr. O.'s conclusion, in which we most cordially join issue with him. With Mr. O., we consider ourselves to be "the messengers of the LORD of Hosts," "the ambassadors of that SAVIOUR who left the glories of heaven, and laid down his life for the salvation of men;" in this character, we consider it to be our commission to preach the Gospel, "the power of GOD unto salvation." With Mr. O., we consider "vital Christianity to be our grand *panacea*;" the only sovereign remedy for the moral and political disorders of society;" "the leaven we would infuse into the whole mass of mankind;" "the salt we would cast, in the name of the LORD, into the pernicious waters, to render them wholesome." With Mr. O., we feel also the great weight of our important office, and think that he must be a man of firm shoulders that is not crushed under it. And when we recollect, moreover, what those divines, St. CHRYSOSTOM and St. AUSTIN said on this subject, we are ready to cry out with St. PAUL, "LORD, who is sufficient for these things?" But when we consider our great and manifold miscarriages in this

weighty undertaking; in the strong language of our  
 Bishop BULL,\* we should "weep tears of blood  
 (if it were possible) for the blood of souls, which we  
 have reason to fear may stick upon our garments."  
 For when it is considered, "how many ways there  
 be, whereby a man may involve himself in the  
 guilt; as not only by an openly vicious example,  
 but even by a less severe, prudent, and wary conver-  
 sation; not only by actions directly criminal, but by  
 lawful actions, when offensive to weak brethren; not  
 only by a gross negligence and supine carelessness,  
 but by every lesser remission of those degrees of zeal  
 and diligence, which are requisite in so important an  
 affair; in a word, by not doing all that lies within  
 our power to save the souls committed to our charge;  
 when I consider this, (for mine own part I cannot)  
 I dare not justify myself, or plead *not guilty* before  
 the great Judge of heaven and earth; but do on  
 the bended knees of my soul bewail my sin, and  
 implore his pardoning grace and mercy, crying  
 mightily unto him, ' Deliver me from this blood  
 guiltiness, O my God, thou God of my salvation;  
 and my tongue shall sing of thy righteousness.'

What remains to be said in conclusion, shall be  
 briefly addressed to those younger students in divinity,  
 for whose sake this Vindication of the Church  
 of England (imperfect as it is) was principally un-  
 dertaken. To persons encircled with the abundant

\* Sermon on James, iii. 1.

means of information, which a learned University affords, it would be presumption in me to say much. The only consideration, therefore, I shall point out to attention, respects the subject immediately before my reader.

It too often happens, that divines, who, from a certain predisposition of mind, or some concurrence of circumstances, become advocates for Calvinism, commit themselves upon it in early days, when (to make use of BARRET's words) they have "scarcely saluted the threshold of divinity," and are not, therefore, qualified to judge of a cause, which can only fairly be ascertained by much comparative reading, accompanied with a cool and discriminating judgment. The fact is, Calvinistic divines, generally speaking, associate only with Calvinists; read, for the most part, only Calvinistic books; and then too easily satisfy themselves with the confident persuasion, that they are arrived at the *ne plus ultra* of their profession. Whilst the great misfortune in this, as in many other cases, is, that however partial may be their knowledge of a subject, when once men commit themselves upon it, "*vestigia nulla retrorsum*;" the pride of human nature insensibly mixes itself with the business, and they feel themselves, as it were, pledged to maintain the ground they have taken; and therefore (for the most part) they industriously and determinedly keep out of sight that evidence, which might convince them of their error.



From these premises the conclusion is obvious: that all early commitment on any particular unestablished system of divinity is scrupulously to be guarded against; because it precludes the attainment of that general information, which is the necessary prelude to complete proficiency in any science. When men form themselves into sects and parties, they for the most part renounce the exercise of reason, and oftentimes are governed by names more than by things. The science of divinity, as it is of all other the most important, so is it the most comprehensive. It is a science commensurate with eternity; and will be brought to perfection only in that state, where "we shall know, even as also we are known." In this science, therefore, it seems to be more particularly necessary, that students should "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest," before they commit themselves to the public. "Θυδὲ σκετλῶ-  
ζειν, καὶ βοᾶν, πρὶν αὖ μαθεῖν."

Such is the consideration, which some experience has induced me to point out to attention. It will be received, I flatter myself, in good part, as coming from one, whose object is truth, and truth not unaccompanied with charity; who would be glad to attend and grace her triumphs, as her faithful soldier, if he has had the honour to serve successfully under her banner; or, as a captive, be content to be tied to her chariot-wheels, if he has either disgraced her cause, or even undesignedly committed offence against it:

means of information, which a learned University affords, it would be presumption in me to say much. The only consideration, therefore, I shall point out to attention, respects the subject immediately before my reader.

It too often happens, that divines, who, from a certain predisposition of mind, or some concurrence of circumstances, become advocates for Calvinism, commit themselves upon it in early days, when (to make use of BARRET's words) they have "scarcely saluted the threshold of divinity," and are not, therefore, qualified to judge of a cause, which can only fairly be ascertained by much comparative reading, accompanied with a cool and discriminating judgment. The fact is, Calvinistic divines, generally speaking, associate only with Calvinists; read, for the most part, only Calvinistic books; and then too easily satisfy themselves with the confident persuasion, that they are arrived at the *ne plus ultra* of their profession. Whilst the great misfortune in this, as in many other cases, is, that however partial may be their knowledge of a subject, when once men commit themselves upon it, "*vestigia nulla retrorsum*;" the pride of human nature insensibly mixes itself with the business, and they feel themselves, as it were, pledged to maintain the ground they have taken; and therefore (for the most part) they industriously and determinedly keep out of sight that evidence, which might convince them of their error.

Early morning of the morning  
REPORT: INFORMATION is the COME  
from the U.S. and NEW YORK  
from the U.S. and NEW YORK

Early morning of the morning  
A. The U.S. and NEW YORK  
and NEW YORK is the U.S. and  
NEW YORK is the U.S. and













